

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XVIII

APRIL, 1936

NUMBER 2

"DOUBLE SOTERIOLOGY" IN PAUL

By FRANCIS C. LIGHTBOURN, St Clement's Church, Philadelphia

In a recent and very important work on Synoptic study,¹ the author contends that there exist side by side, in the teaching of Christ, two distinct doctrines of salvation.

On the one hand, our Lord believed and taught that He Himself was God's Messiah, and that by His preaching and works of healing the long expected Kingdom of God was making its presence felt. The most succinct expression in Christ's teaching of this doctrine of the Kingdom and of His own Messiahship is found in a "Q" passage: "And if I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."² The saying is one of the most significant and, at the same time, one of the most authentic, of our Lord's. While the casting out of demons by others is admitted as a fact, it is of little consequence in comparison with such work when done by Christ. For, if He performs such undertakings, it means no less than the arrival of the Kingdom itself. The natural inference is that this is so only because He is the Messiah—

¹ Easton, *Christ in the Gospels*, p. 154f.

² Luke 11: 19-20 = Matt. 12: 27-28.

God's Agent in bringing the Kingdom. The passage, then, contains a very high Christology. And—to the present writer at least—there is every reason to believe that it goes back to Jesus Himself. It is found in "Q";³ and the first half, asserting, as it does, that others besides our Lord worked miracles, is certainly not the kind of thing that the primitive Christian community would have invented. The remainder follows so naturally that it can scarcely be other than part of the original. Furthermore, the high doctrine of our Lord's Person found in this second half is an inference—a logical and valid one, however—rather than a direct statement, such as those in which the Fourth Gospel abounds,—a fact which greatly favors its authenticity.⁴

From this verse, then, as well as from others,⁵ we have very conclusive evidence that our Lord did regard His work as inaugurating the Kingdom, and Himself as God's Agent in that Divine Act. Hence, to accept Christ is to be in the Kingdom; and all who are in the Kingdom will be saved.

But are these the only ones that will be saved, eventually? According to our Lord's teaching they are not. For He certainly believed that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, though they had lived and died long before the coming of the Kingdom, were nevertheless in God's keeping.⁶ And, in addition to the doctrine of salvation just mentioned, our Lord taught another quite different. Typical of this is the Summary of the Law: "And he [a "certain lawyer"] answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbor as thyself. And he [Jesus] said unto him, Thou hast answered right: *this do, and thou shalt live.*"⁷ Here nothing whatever is said of the necessity of accepting our Lord as Messiah. Love of

³ This alone would not, of course, prove that it is authentic. Still, it forms a high degree of probability for regarding it as such.

⁴ The Hebraism, "by the finger of God," indicates at least that the saying has its roots in Palestinian soil.

⁵ References are unnecessary.

⁶ Mark 12: 26–27 and parallels. There are other passages also.

⁷ Luke 10: 27–28. Italics mine.

God and man is sufficient to guarantee salvation. And the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount—itself simply an expanded version of the Summary—is to the same effect. Both of these would be just as true if uttered by anyone else at any period of history. Their validity is independent of time, place or person. And even in the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin and the Lost Son, which nowadays are considered the heart of the Gospel, the faith required is directed toward God, not Christ.⁸

Now, any doubt as to the presence in our Lord's teaching of this second doctrine of salvation is completely silenced by His estimate of John the Baptist. In another "Q" passage—possessing all the earmarks of reliability—John sends "two of his disciples" to ask our Lord if He really is the Messiah or not.⁹ After bidding these "go and tell John the things which [they] have seen and heard," Jesus says later to the multitudes: "Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he." Such a tribute to the Baptist can only mean that, while there is something about those in the Kingdom which sets off even the lesser of them from the greatest that have gone before, nevertheless John (together with others of his class) will be saved finally. Though not in the present Kingdom, he will, however, have his share in the future, eternal life with God. And the pronouncement just cited cannot have been made in view of any possible change in John's attitude toward Christ. For if that were so, it would have been worded differently. There would not be the contrast that there is between the Baptist and those in

⁸ Luke 15. Luther's discovery of a "type" of the atonement in the killing of the "fatted calf" is fanciful allegorization.

⁹ Luke 7: 18f = Matt. 11: 2f. It must be remembered that modern criticism discovers in the Baptist a rival, rather than the conscious 'forerunner,' of Christ. It is true that John predicted that the Messiah (the *λοχυπόρεψ μον* of Mark 1: 7 and parallels) was shortly to appear; but he never got to the point of identifying him with Jesus. Passages which represent him as so doing (Matt. 3: 14, John 1: 29, etc.) are due to early polemical motives.

the Kingdom; since, in that case, John himself would be a member of the Kingdom, and a much higher place than that of the lesser members would be accorded him. No, the estimate of John here given applies to John the doubter, and to no other. And it means that in our Lord's teaching not only men like Abraham (who have never so much as heard of Him), but also men like the Baptist (who, through what the Catholic Church calls "invincible ignorance," actually reject His claims), will in the general resurrection be saved, though they are excluded from participation in the present Kingdom. Of all such John the Baptist is the Patron Saint.

Such, in substance, is the "double soteriology" doctrine which Dr Easton finds in the teaching of Jesus. Now it is the contention of the present writer that a somewhat similar doctrine can be deduced from St Paul; though, to be sure, we shall not be surprised to find it expressed in very different terms, and to arrive at it by an entirely different route.

Paul's doctrine of two resurrections is familiar enough in technical circles, but it will be well none the less, for the purpose of the present paper, to examine in some detail the evidence for it. I Cor. 15: 20f, in which this is found, conveys at first sight the impression of one resurrection only—in addition, of course, to the Resurrection of Christ. This is that in which "they that are Christ's, at his coming"¹⁰ will be raised. In the King James Version, the English Revision and the American Standard Version, the words following this—*εἶτα τὸ τέλος*—are interpreted, "Then cometh the end," etc. Leitzmann,¹¹ however, takes *τὸ τέλος*—here translated "the end"—as equivalent to *οἱ λοιποὶ*, and renders accordingly—"the remainder," i.e. non-Christians. So translated, vv. 22–24 will read: "For as through Adam all die, so also through Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's, at

¹⁰ Verse 23b.

¹¹ See Peake's Commentary on the Bible, *ad loc.*

his coming; then 'the remainder' ($\tauὸ\ τέλος$), when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God. . . ." ¹²

Thus does Lietzmann arrive at Paul's doctrine of two resurrections—the first, that of departed Christians, taking place at the Parousia; the second, that of non-Christian humanity at the end of Christ's Messianic reign—at the beginning, that is, of the eternal Kingdom. And, even if his rendition of $\tauὸ\ τέλος$ appears forced and unnatural, and we prefer to translate in the ordinary way the phrase embodying it—"then cometh the end" ¹³—nevertheless, we cannot escape the conclusion that Paul believed in two resurrections, for the context renders impossible any other. Verse 22b, $\epsilonὐ\ τῷ\ Χριστῷ\ πάντες\ ἐωποιηθήσονται$, must mean, "through (the) Christ shall all be made alive"; ¹⁴ i.e., a general resurrection of the whole of humanity is guaranteed through Christ's having been raised. If, then, Paul asserts that all mankind will be raised to life, and then proceeds to mention specifically the resurrection of Christians at Christ's return, that of the rest must, in his mind, take place sometime afterwards. That Paul actually conceives of it as happening at the end of Christ's reign is implicit from what follows in vv. 24–26. As Schweitzer ¹⁵ observed, it is included in the series of events herein mentioned. And it is difficult to see how death—"the last

¹² The series of events in Paul's mind is as follows: the second coming of Christ, at which all departed Christians will be raised. At this time also, Christians who are still living will undergo a transformation of their bodies (15: 51–52), so that these may 'match' those of their risen neighbors. The Messianic Kingdom is thus inaugurated, and Christians—all of whom share the resurrection mode of existence—will live under Christ's reign—for how long Paul does not say. This period comes to an end with the resurrection of non-Christians (Lietzmann's 'remainder') and the eternal Kingdom is thereby established.

¹³ In verse 21 above, parts of the same verb have to be supplied.

¹⁴ That this cannot mean, "all [who are] in Christ [i.e. all Christians] shall be made alive"—and no others—is proved by the fact that this half of the verse balances the first, in which "all" (of humanity) die through Adam. Furthermore, the whole verse forms a parallel, after the manner of Hebrew poetry, to the one before it; and there death and life are each said to come 'through' ($\deltaιά$) man. The preposition $\epsilonὐ$ in vs. 22, then, must be equivalent to $\deltaιά$ in vs. 21.

¹⁵ *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery, pp. 67–68.

enemy that shall be abolished" (vs. 26)—can be destroyed without a general resurrection of all flesh *at* the last. The special resurrection of those "that are Christ's"—which Paul mentions as happening before this—was taught by him, "by the word of the Lord," to console his Thessalonian congregation who supposed that Christians who had died before Christ's second coming would forfeit their share in the Messianic Kingdom.¹⁶ There seems, then, to the present investigator at least, no escape from the conclusion that Paul believed in and taught a doctrine of two resurrections—one, of departed Christians at the Parousia; the other, of non-Christians at the end of Christ's Messianic reign.¹⁷

Now Paul cannot intend that all of these non-Christians shall be raised only to eternal damnation. This would be too great a break with previous eschatological thought for a "Hebrew of Hebrews" to make. For, in all eschatologies incorporating a resurrection as one of their features, it is the norm for some of the risen to be saved, and some damned.¹⁸ And, as a matter of fact, Paul, like our Lord Himself, actually did believe that Abraham (and therefore others of the Old Dispensation who shared his 'faith') would be saved at the last.¹⁹ The resurrection of these will, of course, take place as the second of those mentioned.

¹⁶ I Thess. 4: 13f. Cf. also Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 91f.

¹⁷ The present writer, while thus at one with Lietzmann in holding that there are two resurrections in the passage before us, cannot, however, accept 'the remainder' as the meaning of *τὸ τέλος* itself. Rather, it seems that Paul, having in vv. 22–23 made the assertion that "through Christ shall all be made alive, but each in his own order," intended then to enumerate these several orders. This he does as far as the second—"they that are Christ's"—(somewhat illogically making Christ's own resurrection the first), but, instead of going on to make specific mention of the third, he lists the whole series of events in which that is included, comprehended under the general title *τὸ τέλος*. Such a procedure would be characteristic of Paul's oftentimes rugged and logically inconsistent style. It must be admitted, however, that Lietzmann's rendition of *τὸ τέλος* brings out the meaning best in English.

¹⁸ Dan. 12: 2; 2 Esdras 7: 32f; Apoc. Bar. 30: 1–4.

¹⁹ Rom. 4: 1f. Since "justification," in the Pauline sense, normally carries with it both "sanctification" and "glorification" (8: 29f), we may take this as

But did Paul believe in the salvation of men like the Baptist, who, knowing Christ, nevertheless for conscientious reasons rejected His doctrine of His own Person? There seems to be no evidence to show that he did. If proof were forthcoming (1) that he was aware of John's non-acceptance of Jesus as Messiah, and (2) that he believed John, in spite of this, to be saved, then his 'double soteriology' could be fitted into our Lord's exactly. But there is no real evidence that Paul so much as knew of the existence of the Baptist, let alone that he was aware of the attitude of the latter toward Christ.²⁰

We submit, therefore, that—so far as we can determine with any degree of certainty—Paul's double soteriology is not quite like our Lord's. With our Lord, he believed that men like Abraham, who had never heard of Him, might be saved; but that he held the same opinion with regard to the Baptist (and others of his class) is at best a conjecture, though by no means an unreasonable one. Nevertheless, such similarity as there is between the two double soteriologies which we have been considering points in the direction of further confirmation of the now commonly accepted view that there is less difference between the teaching of Paul and that of our Lord than was once thought.

tantamount to saying that Abraham will be 'saved.' The "Gentiles that have not the law" but "do by nature the things of the law" of 2: 14 are another case in point.

²⁰ He is not mentioned in any of the Pauline epistles, even if we extend the number to include all that the A.V. attributes to the apostle.

Nor can Acts 13: 24-25 and 19: 3-4 be taken as evidence for Paul's knowledge of the Baptist. The speeches of Acts are not *verbatim* reports which can be accepted in the absence of testimony from elsewhere. And the latter passage gives itself away at the outset, for it explicitly makes John identify Jesus with the expected Messiah—a thing which from the Synoptic record we know that he did not do. The words "that is, on Jesus" (vs. 4) may of course be an editorial gloss on an otherwise trustworthy source. But even so, the passage tells us nothing that would warrant our believing Paul's knowledge and estimate of John to be the same as our Lord's.

A NOTE ON II THESSALONIANS 2:2

By JOHN KNOX, Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee

It is now generally recognized that the words ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου (II Thess. 2:2) can be naturally taken only as referring to a present fact, and not to a future event, however immediate. Consistent contemporary usage, abundantly exemplified, requires this understanding, and most if not all of the recent translations of the New Testament, as well as the English Revised Version, render the clause in some such manner as "the day of the Lord has already come." Many interpreters, however, have hesitated to adopt this admittedly natural sense of the passage because of the supposed historical difficulties involved. In view of what was plainly the teaching of Paul and of the early Christian evangelists generally about the "Day of the Lord" as a highly supernatural event or series of events, how could the Thessalonians have entertained even for a moment the illusion that it was already present? The difficulty seems insuperable. Thus it is frequently insisted that the perfect tense is used merely to emphasize the imminence of the future cataclysm. Doubtless for this reason the American Revisers are content to alter the King James "at hand" to the barely distinguishable "just at hand."

It should be noted, however, that to take the clause at its face value does not involve the conclusion that the Thessalonians were under the incredible misapprehension that the "Day" had come, but only that the author of II Thessalonians understood that they were. And this is far more easily credible. In fact, would not such a belief on their part be the inference which a man like Paul (if we may tentatively assume his authorship of the letter) would naturally draw from the news of the disturbances at Thessalonikē which had evidently reached him? He has heard of the unhealthy ex-

citement among his converts there about the *παροντία*. He is quite sure that he has said or written nothing to them that might occasion it. To be sure, he has more than once asserted his belief in the early end of the age, but it would not occur to him that their acceptance of that common view might have such distressing consequences. What more natural than that he should conclude, especially if the report from Thessalonikē represented a letter of his own as occasioning the excitement, that someone else had written the church there "ώστε δι' ἡμῶν" that the day of the Lord had already come? In other words, although it is possible that the Thessalonians' too thorough-going acceptance of Paul's teaching in the first letter and in his preaching about the *imminence* of the Lord's coming did actually occasion the trouble, he himself may well have been able to account for it only by inferring a belief on their part that it had then taken place.

The fact that *ἐνέστηκεν* means "is present" has bearing upon at least two points of some importance in the discussion of the authenticity of II Thessalonians. For one thing, it is not the word a writer would have used in stating the teaching of I Thessalonians about the end of the age. If, as is often urged, the writer of the second letter was endeavoring rather explicitly to displace the eschatological teaching of the genuine I Thessalonians with his own, one would have expected him to describe that teaching more accurately. A second inference which cannot be escaped is that the eschatological paragraph in II Thessalonians is not designed to refute the quite Pauline view that the Day of the Lord is near, but to answer the supposed contention that it is already present. Thus, the apparent divergence between the eschatological teaching of I and II Thessalonians is sensibly narrowed. I Thessalonians suggests that the end is near; II Thessalonians is concerned to show that it has not yet arrived.

THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK DRAMA ON THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN

By RAYMOND R. BREWER, The James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.

The interpreters of the Apocalypse of John have paid much attention to its indebtedness to Jewish and Christian apocalyptic thought and literature. The relationship of this piece of New Testament writing to Jewish apocalypses is too evident to require any emphasis in this paper. But the extent of the author's indebtedness to Jewish thought has tended to detract attention from the question of other possible sources of literary and conceptual influence. Nevertheless, the dramatic quality of the book must be evident to any one possessing the slightest literary sensitivity. Emotion, plot, action, rhythm, and climax are all characteristics of this moving work. Even the scene changes as the theme unfolds and the action moves on to a dramatic and catastrophic climax. These are the characteristics of the Greek drama, just as vision, trance, and veiled symbolism are the familiar marks of the Jewish apocalypse.

All strenuous living is marked by a dramatic quality. Certainly the conditions under which the people to whom the apocalypse was addressed and for whose encouragement it was written were hazardous enough to make living tragic. The Roman state interpreted the unwillingness of Christians to accord divine honors to the emperor as disloyalty so serious as to justify it in proceeding against such suspicious non-conformists. To a Roman official, such unwillingness was tantamount to rebellion—and rebellion must be crushed at all costs.

The Christians of the Roman province of Asia, in particular, had felt the heavy hand of the state. The Ephesians had "undergone much" for the sake of Christ.¹ The faithful of

¹ 2: 3.

Smyrna were to be imprisoned by the devil to be tested and "for ten days to endure persecution."² At Pergamum, where Satan had "his throne," the Christians had clung to the name of Christ and had not renounced their faith in Him, even when the persecution resulted in the martyrdom of Antipas.³ The church at Thyatira was commended for its "faithfulness" and "endurance."⁴ At Sardis there were a few who had "not soiled their clothes" and who were worthy to walk with Christ "clad in white,"⁵ the sign of their Christian loyalty.⁶ The Philadelphians were commended for not having disowned the name of Christ and were promised protection "in the time of testing that is going to come upon the whole world, to test the inhabitants of the earth."⁷ The Laodiceans had apparently been so indifferent to the demands of loyalty to the name of Jesus, that they were condemned for their neutrality and were exhorted to buy gold "tested with fire" and "white clothes to put on."⁸ Each church was promised a reward for the kind of loyalty required in a time of persecution.⁹ Moreover, John himself was an exile for "uttering God's message and testifying to Jesus."¹⁰ He refers to himself as a "brother and companion in the distress, the kingdom, and the endurance that Christ brings."¹¹

A casual reading of the letters to the seven churches will suffice to reveal the difficulty of the task confronting the Apocalypticist. A persecution of short duration may, perchance, be endured heroically. But continued persecution results in weakened resistance and relaxed morale on the part of many. No mere exhortation, however eloquent, is quite

² 2: 10.

³ 2: 13.

⁴ 2: 19.

⁵ 3: 4.

⁶ 3: 5; 6: 11; 7: 9, 14.

⁷ 3: 8, 10.

⁸ 3: 15-18.

⁹ 2: 7, 11, 17, 26ff; 3: 5, 12, 21.

¹⁰ 1: 9.

¹¹ 1: 9.

sufficient to meet the situation. An appeal to the conscience will fail when conscientious scruples are outweighed by other considerations. The emotions must be aroused and the imagination kindled to support the soul exhausted by the strain of continued uncertainty and persecution.

It was such a task as this that confronted the writer of Daniel. To encourage the Maccabean martyrs, he supplemented his revelations of the future by the stories of Daniel and the Hebrew youths in Babylon. John, using the familiar apocalyptic style and imagery, employed another method to stimulate his Christian readers and hearers. He implemented and supplemented the familiar Jewish apocalyptic with a dramatic setting and style which, I believe, owe their inspiration to the Greek theater and its drama.

In view of this suggestion, two pertinent questions may be asked. The first is, how widespread was the influence of the Greek theater in the province of Asia? In the second place, what likelihood is there that the Christians of Asia in John's time were familiar with the Greek theater and its dramatic presentations?

In considering the first question, one only needs point to the prevalence of the theater throughout the province of Asia as attested by archaeological discoveries. Müller names no less than thirty-seven cities and towns on the mainland of this province at which ruins of theaters have been found.¹² These towns included Ephesus, Pergamum, Smyrna, Sardis, and Laodicea.¹³ To these five of the seven churches addressed by

¹² The cities and towns mentioned are as follows: Mysia-Cyzicus, Parium, Novum Ilium, Troas, Assos, Pergamum; Lydia-Smyrna, Clazomenae, Erythrae, Teos, Ephesus, Sardis; Caria-Magnesia, Priene, Heraclea, Miletus, Iassus, Bargylia, Halicarnassus, Cnidus, Caunus, Euromus, Mylasa, Stratonicea, Tralles, Nysa, Mystaura, Aphrodisias, Alabanda, Alinda; Phrygia-Laodicea, Hierapolis, Apameia Cibotus, Auzanoi, Blaundus, and Trajanopolis. *Lehrbuch der griechischen Bühnenaltertümer*, pp. 11-12.

¹³ According to Coborn, *The New Archaeological Discoveries and Their Bearing on the New Testament*, p. 570, limited excavations at Laodicea have revealed two theater sites. The question whether they existed simultaneously or successively is not discussed.

John, Barton¹⁴ adds Philadelphia as having at least one theater. The theater at Ephesus, which should be of particular interest to us, was, according to Coborn, "the central object in the ancient city The orchestra was 80 X 37 ft., being supported by twenty pillars and ten square piers. . . . By 66 A.D. the work (of altering and improving) was practically completed. In the lowest of the sixty-six tiers of seats were twelve wonderful marble thrones, one or two of which still remain almost intact, presumably having been erected for high officials or victors in the games."¹⁵ This Ephesian theater, therefore, was in existence when the Apocalypse was written. It had, doubtless, been seen many times by the writer, whose manifest interest in the Ephesian church marks him as very familiar with it, if, indeed, he is not a member of it. From the above, it would seem that practically every city or town of any considerable importance was graced with at least one theater.

Further confirmation of the prevalence of the theater and the drama is seen in the popularization of the tragic drama which became a "more or less familiar spectacle, during the Hellenistic period, in every part of the world where Greek colonists were settled."¹⁶ While at first apparently associated with the worship of Dionysus, theatrical exhibitions were very numerous in connection with non-Dionysiac assemblies.¹⁷ Philostratus tells us of the exhibition of tragedy at the Olympia at Smyrna.¹⁸ Epigraphical remains indicate that it was also employed at the *Kouà Aσιας* or public games at Philadelphia.¹⁹ While no longer a peculiar characteristic of the Dionysia, dramatic exhibitions were practically always confined to gatherings in honor of the gods.²⁰

¹⁴ *Archaeology and Bible*, p. 245.

¹⁵ Coborn, *op. cit.*, p. 472f, cites *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xx, pp. 178-81; xxiii, pp. 347-50, 187-196; xxvi, pp. 25-35.

¹⁶ Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, pp. 436, 438.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 437.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 437n citing Philostratus, *Life of Sophocles*, I. 25. 3, 9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 437n citing C.I.G., 1420.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 437.

The connection of the drama with the worship of Dionysus has an important bearing on our problem. It is well recognized that Dionysiac festivals were well nigh universal throughout Greece proper, on the islands, and in the colonies.²¹ This favored the spread of dramatic performances which are not infrequently mentioned in connection with the feasts of the wine god.²² It is of special interest to know that the Dionysiac cult flourished throughout Asia Minor. Among the places where it existed were Miletus²³—which is of importance because of its relation to Ephesus—Smyrna,²⁴ and Ephesus itself.²⁵ At the last two places, inscriptions inform us, dramatic exhibitions were performed at the Dionysiac feasts.²⁶ One dedicatory inscription contains the names of certain individuals “who offered votive gifts to Artemis and celebrated the mysteries of Dionysus at the very era when the Ephesian church was having its fight with paganism.”²⁷

In answering the second question, it may be said that the facts here set forth imply a high degree of probability that the Christians of at least six of the seven churches had, at some time or other, seen a Greek theater, and, more than likely, a Greek play. If the associations of the Greek theater with Gentile religious cults are advanced as a reason why Christians might not attend Greek plays, the same reason would hardly apply with regard to the simple appointments of the Greek theater, located, as it usually was, in a frequented quarter of the city.²⁸ This alone would be of considerable significance, as we shall see later.

But at least some of the Christians seem to have been

²¹ Haigh, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 438n; Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

²³ Diod. xiii, cited by Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 378, n. 4.

²⁴ Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* I, 25, p. 227 Kays, cited by Müller, *op. cit.* p. 378, n. 4.

²⁵ Hicks, *Hist. Insc.*, 150, cited by Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 378 n. 4.

²⁶ Müller, *op. cit.*, n. 5.

²⁷ Coborn, *op. cit.*, pp. 474-475, cf. Heberdey, *Forschungen in Ephesos*, Vol. II, p. 161.

²⁸ Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

Gentiles with a pagan background.²⁹ This is exactly what one would expect of Christian churches in Asia Minor in the last decade of the first century—forty years after Paul's work among them. Whatever may have been their attitude toward the theater as Christians, it is more than likely that they had been familiar with it prior to their having become members of the Christian brotherhoods. But even if some of them, including the writer, were Jews, there is no compelling reason for denying them familiarity with the theater. One could hardly expect the anti-Hellenistic prejudices of Palestinian Pharisees to be perpetuated in syncretistic Asia Minor. At all events, an inscription in the theater of Miletus, doubtless of the Imperial period, marks the fifth row of seats from the bottom as the "place of the Jews, who are also called God-fearing."³⁰

If there were no other reason for assuming a general familiarity with the theater on the part of the Christians of Asia, the book of Revelation itself provides convincing evidence of such knowledge. A full appreciation of the dramatic power of the book presupposes some acquaintance with the choral music and the histrionic art of the only drama the people of that day knew. Studied from this standpoint, the Apocalypse is seen to contain numerous indications that John was writing to people who were as familiar with Greek drama as they were with Jewish apocalyptic.

As a background for the discussion of the indebtedness of the Apocalypse to the Greek theater and its drama, it may be well to recall those features of each which seem to have some relation to our thesis. The theater, in its fully developed form, consisted of three main parts:—the orchestra, the auditorium, and the scene building. The orchestra was, roughly, a full circle, which, until Roman times, was probably occupied by both chorus and actors.³¹ Somewhere within this

²⁹ 2: 14, 20.

³⁰ Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, 2d Eng. ed., pp. 451f.

³¹ Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*, pp. 79ff; cf. p. 60.

circle, usually in the center, was an altar erected to Dionysus. Upon it sacrifices were offered as a preliminary to the dramatic performances in honor of the god or gods.³² In the auditorium the seats of the lowest or front row were often in the form of thrones. These were occupied by priests or other dignitaries.³³ As has been observed above, the theater at Ephesus had twelve such thrones.

As acting became more complicated and dressing rooms were required to accommodate the actors, a scene building, was added. Later, this also served as a background for the actors. During the Roman period the Greek theater was modified. A stage was added and the front of the building, *proscenium*, stood upon the stage. The top of the proscenium was called the *theologium* (*θεολογεῖον*), or speaking place of the gods.³⁴ The Ephesian theater, which was in existence at the time of the writing of the Apocalypse, was of this Graeco-Roman type.

The origin of the Greek drama probably dates from the time of the Bacchic dithyramb, whence the name tragedy, that is, *tragodia* or goat song. It was raised to first rank in literature by Aeschylus, who extended its functions to include the discussion of the problems of morals and religion.³⁵ Though tragedy declined after the third century, new dramas were produced and classical plays given late in the Graeco-Roman period.³⁶ Comedy was a continuation of the early satyr play and came to be included in the religious celebrations in honor of Dionysus.³⁷

One of the most interesting features of the Greek drama was the chorus. In the performance of its role it combined

³² Haigh, *The Attic Theater*, 3d ed., p. 107; cf. Rev. 8: 3, 5; 9: 13.

³³ Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 67, n. 7; pp. 91ff.; *Enc. Brit.* 11th ed., art. "Theatre"; cf. Flickinger, *op. cit.* p. 90.

³⁴ Flickinger, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

³⁵ Ridgeway, *The Origin of Tragedy*.

³⁶ Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*, p. 41; Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, p. 450; cf. Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, 4: 21.

³⁷ Haigh, *The Attic Theater*, 3d ed., pp. 5f.

the elements of speech, music, and gesture.³⁸ In the tragic dramas it is not infrequently found exhorting the spectators "to preserve a pious attitude toward the gods."³⁹ The chorutae, or members of the chorus, were usually disguised to represent the characters appropriate to their role, animal disguises being common.⁴⁰ In comedy a double chorus of twenty-four persons was used.⁴¹ This was frequently divided into two semi-choruses,⁴² one of which sang the ode while the other sang the antode.⁴³ The size of the chorus in the Graeco-Roman period is a matter of a good deal of uncertainty, but that the chorus was generally employed in both tragic and comic productions as late as the period in which the Apocalypse was written is well attested by epigraphical and literary allusions.⁴⁴

The dramatic quality of the Apocalypse has not infrequently been noted by commentators and interpreters. Palmer sees in the work a drama of five acts and three scenes.⁴⁵ Charles says, "The superiority of the Apocalypse to other apocalypses, in this respect (dramatic movement), is not merely relative but absolute."⁴⁶ Likewise, Robertson takes cognizance of the musical element in the Apocalypse when he refers to the "non-metrical hymns in Revelation,"⁴⁷ and cites "examples of primitive Christian song in Rev. 5: 12-14, and often in this book."⁴⁸ Jülicher maintains that the

³⁸ Moulton, *The Ancient Classical Drama*, p. 9.

³⁹ Shelley, *A Study of Piety in the Greek Tragic Chorus*, p. 8.

⁴⁰ Flickinger, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁴¹ Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

⁴² Haigh, *The Attic Theater*, 3d ed., p. 309.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 304. Compare the antiphonal choruses of Revelation.

⁴⁴ Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, pp. 452f.

The choruses in Revelation vary from four members to choruses universal in scope. Do they indicate irregularity in the size of Greek choruses, or are they merely modifications of the Greek model?

⁴⁵ Palmer, *The Drama of the Apocalypse*. Cf. Benson, *The Apocalypse*.

⁴⁶ Charles, *The Revelation of John*, I, p. lxxxvii.

⁴⁷ Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed., p. 242.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 1199f.

author is familiar with Greek poetry.⁴⁹ But none of these, excepting, possibly, the last, has seen or admitted any connection between the dramatic quality of this work, and the Greek theater and its dramatic presentations. And yet, I am convinced, the author sought to heighten the dramatic power of his Revelation by giving it the setting of a Greek theater. Likewise, he undertook to intensify its religious appeal by employing choruses, unique in personnel and frequently unlimited in number, to sound the great emotional overtones of a cosmic drama.

So complicated and so sweeping is the action implied in the visions of the Seer that they can best be reduced to unity by assuming that he was carried in imagination to a celestial scene, which had the familiar setting of the Greek theater. Here he saw enacted events which had as their scenic background heaven, the earth, the intervening space, and even the underworld. Though he appears to have been transported hither and yon in heaven and on earth, neither he, nor the scenes which he beheld, quite lost contact with the theatrical setting described at the beginning of the series of visionary revelations.⁵⁰

In this first revelatory trance, he saw a throne with an ineffable being seated upon it, who occasionally employed articulate speech⁵¹ as well as the portentous language of "lightning, rumblings, and peals of thunder."⁵² The position of the throne corresponded to the position of the stage or, perhaps, the theogium in the Graeco-Roman theater at Ephesus. Before the throne, there stretched what looked "like a sea of glass, like crystal"⁵³—that is, the smooth hard floor of the orchestra.⁵⁴ "Around the throne," following the

⁴⁹ Jülicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 272.

⁵⁰ 4: 1ff.

⁵¹ 3: 16; 17; 19: 5; 21: 3, 5.

⁵² 4: 5. Cf. 8: 5; 10: 4; 11: 19; 16: 18.

⁵³ 4: 6. Cf. 15: 2.

⁵⁴ As a usual thing the floor of the theater was of earth, beaten hard. In the Roman remodeled theaters, the orchestra was sometimes of marble.

curved lines of the auditorium, were the thrones of the twenty four crowned elders. The position of these thrones doubtless corresponded to the *proedria* or front seats of the Greek theater, and were probably suggested by the thrones in the front row of the auditorium of the theater at Ephesus. This is much more natural than to assume that they surrounded the throne in a circle with the throne as its center. This would have been an appropriate position if they were to have acted as protectors of the throne, but an entirely unnatural position from which to "fall down before him," "throw down their crowns before the throne" and "worship him who lives forever and ever." To complete the theatrical setting, there stood before the throne, and apparently in the center of the orchestra, an altar which had a considerable place in the unfolding drama.⁵⁵

Somewhere within this setting, John saw and heard a chorus of four seraphic beings. Evidently they were wearing the masks of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle for their actions were not so much like those of the animals represented as of men or angels. The Seer had, doubtless, seen the masked chorutae of the Greek theater and, hence, he invested his chorus with a character modeled somewhat after that of the winged, four-faced creatures of Ezekiel 1: 5-10.⁵⁶ The role they played corresponded roughly to that of the leaders of the Greek choruses, or, perhaps, to a smaller chorus singing the ode to which the chorus of elders responded with the antode.

The position occupied by this unique chorus has been the subject of much conjecture. Charles thinks it surrounded the throne in a circle. This is, of course, a plausible inference based on a literal interpretation of the text. However, the same objection as urged against a circle of elders may be invoked here. It was the function of this chorus to offer praise day and night to the one who sat on the throne. A

⁵⁵ 8: 3, 5; 9: 13; 16: 7. Cf. 5: 6.

⁵⁶ Cf. Isa. 6: 2.

circle of four around the throne would mean that only one faced the throne while two faced the sides and one the rear of the throne—unless they alternated in their positions by rotating about the throne after the manner of the Bacchic dance. Moreover, this interpretation is rendered still more unlikely by a study of the relative positions suggested in 5:6. "Then I saw standing in the center (*ἐν μέσῳ*) of the throne and of the four animals and of the elders a Lamb which seemed to have been slaughtered." On the assumption that the elders and the animals encircled the throne the position occupied by the Lamb would have coincided with the throne, unless *ἐν μέσῳ* be taken to mean, merely "within the circle" of the four animals and the elders. In that case *τοῦ θρόνου* becomes superfluous.

This difficulty is lessened if the positions are studied in the light of the Greek theater. The elders were around the throne in the sense that they occupied the front row in the Greek auditorium. Immediately in front of the throne and midway between the throne and the opposite side of the orchestra stood the Lamb "which seemed to have been slaughtered." This was the natural position for the Lamb bearing the marks of a sacrificial victim, because this was usually the location occupied by the altar in the Greek theater, and the Lamb and the altar seemed to have been associated in the thought of the author as we shall see later. On this assumption, the chorus of animals may be thought of as forming a semicircle immediately in front of the throne with the altar, or Lamb, occupying a point midway between them and the elders who formed the outer circle of the orchestra.⁵⁷ This may be the meaning which the phraseology of 5:6, "*ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων λύκων καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,*"⁵⁸ was intended to convey.

However, the phraseology of 4:6, *καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ*

⁵⁷ This is also De Wette's view of the positions occupied by the throne, the animals, the Lamb and the elders. See Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*.

⁵⁸ Cf. Charles, *op. cit.*, I, p. 140.

κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου, is more perplexing. Charles would obviate the difficulty by eliminating *καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου* as a gloss or a mistranslation of Ezekiel 1: 26.⁵⁹ It is quite possible that it is a scribal error based upon 5: 6. It is equally possible that, through an error in transcription, the phrase *καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ* may have been omitted, the addition of which would bring 4: 6 into conformity with 5: 6. However, in the absence of textual confirmation it is impossible to dogmatize on these points. Moreover, I am inclined to think that the general thought of the author is expressed in 5: 6.

Let us now return to a consideration of the altar and its place in the scene which the Apocalypticist gazed upon. We have already indicated above that the altar occupied a central position in the Greek theater, due to the fact that, from the time of the dithyramb, the altar was of central significance in the rites which gave rise to and determined the function of the Greek drama. In the opening description of the heavenly scene, which greeted the Seer, no mention is made of an altar. But a Lamb "which seemed to have been sacrificed" is mentioned as standing in the midst of the throne and of the elders.⁶⁰ In 6: 9 John sees "underneath the altar" the souls of those who had been martyred. This casual mention of the altar suggests that the author did not realize that he was mentioning it for the first time. Indeed, I believe he thought of the altar as implied by the mention of the Lamb, who had the character of a sacrificial victim. This was an altar of gold from the corners of which a voice addressed one of the angels charged with the responsibility of carrying out many of the divine plans revealed to the Apocalypticist.⁶¹ Again it spoke to express approval of the decrees of God.⁶² These allusions to the speaking altar may imply a further identification of the Lamb with the altar itself. That it

⁵⁹ Charles, *op. cit.*, I, *ad loc.*

⁶⁰ 8: 3.

⁶¹ 9: 13.

⁶² 16: 7.

occupied an important place among the permanent appointments of the theatrical setting is indicated by the fact that, after the breaking of the seventh seal, an angel approached the altar to mingle an offering of incense with the prayers of God's people.⁶³ From it he then took fire and hurled it upon the earth with catastrophic effect.⁶⁴

The question concerning the nature and location of this altar has been the subject of a good deal of debate and, it seems to me, no little misunderstanding. Charles says, ". . . most interpreters (Ebrard, Bousset, and Swete are mentioned) agree that two altars—the altar of burnt offering and the altar of incense—are referred to in our text. But if we assume a complete heavenly temple with a holy place, a holy of holies, two altars, etc., we are forced to conclude (1) with Hengstenberg and Züllig that the curtain of the holy of holies is closed in iv and viii, 3 sqq and not opened until xi. 19; or (2) with Hofmann, that the roof of the temple was removed in order to make possible the vision of God on his throne of cherubim and yet not that of the ark; or (3) with Ebrard, that, in the vision of iv, the whole scene was disclosed without the temple, and that later in vi. 9 and viii. 3 sqq a heavenly temple appeared on a terrace below the height on which the throne stood; or (4), with Bousset and Porter, that the conception of iv. 7, viii. 3 sqq referring to the throne scenery and the temple, are wholly irreconcilable."⁶⁵ Charles admits that these labored views rest on a misconception, but his own explanation is no more convincing. He thinks that the throne and the altar are in the temple; and further, that the throne as the special seat of God, the altar, the four animal-like beings, the twenty four elders, and the ark of the covenant are all in the holy of holies!⁶⁶

These complicated and well-nigh ludicrous explanations

⁶³ 8: 3.

⁶⁴ 8: 5.

⁶⁵ Charles, *op. cit.*, I, p. 227.

⁶⁶ Charles, *op. cit.*, I, p. 227.

would be made wholly unnecessary if the whole were viewed against the Greek background of the theater instead of against the Jewish background of the Jerusalem temple. The throne and the altar were not in the temple but were fixed points in the theatrical setting. The altar was in the center of the orchestra.⁶⁷ On the other hand, the opening of the temple and the revelation of the ark of the covenant⁶⁸ constituted a part of the drama upon the stage, or, perhaps, in the orchestra itself, and the temple and the ark are not to be considered as part of the setting described in the fourth chapter. The opening of the temple, disclosing the ark was only one of many events which the Seer, as a spectator, seated near enough the elders to be able to converse with them,⁶⁹ saw transpiring before his wondering eyes.

The thought of John as occupying a position similar to that of a spectator in the theater is doubtless obscured by the frequent references to visions and trances in which he was transported from place to place to view some particular event. These are, of course, the familiar vehicles of apocalyptic thought. Instead of occupying a relatively fixed position he seems to have taken part in the action by eating the scroll,⁷⁰ and by measuring the temple and the altar.⁷¹ He stood on the seashore;⁷² he heard a sound from heaven;⁷³ he was transported to the desert;⁷⁴ and was carried to a high

⁶⁷ If the question should be raised whether or not the altar was retained in the Romanized theater of Ephesus, it may be pointed out that the chief modification of the Greek or Hellenistic theater in the Graeco-Roman period was the elaboration of the scene building, the raising of the stage, and the enlarging of the orchestra by the removal of the three lower rows of seats. As this was an alteration of a still older theater, the altar of the older theater doubtless remained. Flickinger (*op. cit.*, p. 73) points out that the Greek theater at Athens, remodeled after the visit of Nero in 67 A.D., retained the altar. Cf. Dörpfeld, *Jahrbuch des archäologischen Instituts, Anzeiger*, xxviii (1913), pp. 38f.

⁶⁸ 11: 19. Cf. 15: 5-16: 1.

⁶⁹ 4: 4; 7: 13f.

⁷⁰ 10: 8-10.

⁷¹ 11: 1f.

⁷² 13: 1.

⁷³ 14: 2, 13; 18: 4.

⁷⁴ 17: 3.

mountain where he saw Jerusalem descending from heaven.⁷⁵ Yet, in spite of these imaginary migrations, he did not lose contact with the celestial scene described in the fourth chapter. He had been transported to earth and yet apparently, while still standing on the sand of the seashore with the sea and the land in full view,⁷⁶ he was within clear sight of the crystalline orchestra with its speaking altar,⁷⁷ and its singing choruses.⁷⁸ Though carried to a desert,⁷⁹ he still saw the throne and heard the voice of the one upon it.⁸⁰ He could see the twenty four elders and the four animals falling before the throne in the act of adoration, and hear their voices mingled with a multitudinous chorus shouting praises to God.⁸¹ Hence it appears that the visionary movements of the Seer were more than mere adaptations to apocalyptic terminology. They served to re-orient the reader to changing scenes so sweeping and kaleidoscopic as to be quite beyond the power of contemporary dramatic art to portray within the limited scope of a Greek theater. That they were intended to serve this purpose would appear from the fact that the theatrical setting described above was never forgotten or lost sight of amid all the cataclysmic events involving heaven, the earth, and the underworld. Furthermore, in and through them all, John never wholly discarded his role as a spectator occupying a vantage point in the auditorium near that of the elders.

What seems to me to be conclusive evidence of the influence of the Greek drama on the Apocalypse is to be found in the extensive use of choruses throughout the whole drama as set forth in chapters 4-22. It is noteworthy that a writing so heavily indebted to apocalyptic models should so far depart

⁷⁵ 21: 10.

⁷⁶ 13: I, II.

⁷⁷ 16: 7.

⁷⁸ 15: 2-4.

⁷⁹ 17: 3.

⁸⁰ 16: 17; 19: 4, 5; 20: 11; 21: 3, 5.

⁸¹ 19: 1-4.

from them as to make almost constant use of one of the most outstanding characteristics of Greek dramatic literature—choral song. The very multiplicity of choruses in Revelation—varying in the number and character of their members—seems to me a clear indication that the author was familiar with Greek choruses varying in character and number according to the requirements of the role assigned them. Here we have a chorus of four, disguised as winged animals or masked seraphim whose duty it is to give unceasing praise to God;⁸² a chorus of twenty four dignified elders who respond to the odes of the animals by chanting an antode and solemnly prostrating themselves and throwing their crowns before the throne seven different times in the course of the dramatic representation;⁸³ an enormous ensemble of angels, animals, and elders “numbering myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands”;⁸⁴ a universal chorus consisting of “every creature in heaven, on earth, underneath the earth, and on the sea, and all that they contain” singing,

“Blessing, honor, glory and power⁸⁵
To him who is seated on the throne
And to the Lamb forever and ever”;

a chorus of martyrs underneath the altars;⁸⁶ a heterogeneous chorus of “kings, nobles, officers, the rich, the strong—everybody, slave and free”—hiding in the caves and among the rocks, beseeching the mountains and the rocks to conceal them from the one seated on the throne and from the anger of the Lamb;⁸⁷ an innumerable chorus of the redeemed from every nation, tribe, people, and language wearing white robes, waving palm branches, and singing a pean of praise for their

⁸² 4: 6ff.

⁸³ 4: 10f; 5: 8, 11, 14; 7: 11; 11: 16f; 19: 4.

⁸⁴ 5: 11f. The quotations are from *The New Testament, An American Translation*, by Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed.

⁸⁵ 5: 13.

⁸⁶ 6: 9ff.

⁸⁷ 6: 15-17.

deliverance from further persecution;⁸⁸ an invisible chorus in heaven singing,

"The sovereignty of this world has passed
Into the possession of our Lord and of his Christ,
And he shall reign forever and ever";⁸⁹

a jubilant chorus of those who were victors over the animal and its statue, standing in the orchestra, with harps—the characteristic instrument of accompaniment in the Greek tragic chorus—in their hands (were they also dancing?) and singing,

"Great and marvelous are your doings,
Lord God Almighty!
Upright and true are your ways,
King of the Ages!
Who shall not fear and give glory to your name, Lord?
For you alone are holy.
All the heathen will come and worship before you,
For the justice of your sentences has now been shown!"⁹⁰

Finally, he hears, like a mighty crescendo, the shout of a great invisible multitude⁹¹ accompanied by the "noise of many waters and the sound of mighty thunders" uniting in one great chorus of "Hallelujah; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"⁹² In addition to these, John heard a voice from heaven announcing that weeping choruses of kings, merchants, middlemen, and all sea-faring men will lament the fall of mighty Babylon whose judgment is to overtake here in a single hour.⁹³

In the main these choruses bear the same relation to the rest of the book as the Greek choruses bore to the main movement of their dramas. They formed the bond between the lyric and the dramatic elements in the plot.⁹⁴ They, and

⁸⁸ 7: 9ff.

⁸⁹ 11: 15.

⁹⁰ 15: 2-4.

⁹¹ 19: 1ff.

⁹² 19: 6-8.

⁹³ 18: 4-19.

⁹⁴ Cf. Moulton, *op. cit.* p. 65.

the chorus of elders in particular, are the bond of unity running through the swiftly moving action and the ever shifting scenes of the book.⁹⁵ Like the tragic choruses of Aeschylus,⁹⁶ the choruses of Revelation, in language more stately and with thoughts more sublime, hymn the praise of the Deity,⁹⁷ whose succor they implore⁹⁸ and whose acts they approve.⁹⁹

In common also with the Greek choruses, costumes appropriate to their role distinguished several of the choruses of the Apocalypse. For example, masks resembling the faces of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle were worn by the chorus of seraphs about the throne,¹⁰⁰ and crowns befitting their dignity were worn by the enthroned elders.¹⁰¹ The martyrs, too, carried palm branches in token of their victorious deliverance and were given white robes indicative of their loyalty.¹⁰² The mixed chorus of kings, nobles, officers, etc., should doubtless be thought of as costumed according to the rank of the members of the chorus.¹⁰³

Space will not permit an adequate discussion of the lyric solos of Revelation. We must be content merely to point out that the Greek drama frequently contained lyric passages intended to be sung as solos by one of the actors who did not belong to the chorus.¹⁰⁴ So, too, the Apocalypse contains numerous lyric passages, resembling the rhythmic parallelism of the Psalms, which were sung (or spoken) by angels or some invisible singer. Examples of such solos are found in 12: 10-12; 14: 7, 8, 9-11, 15, 18; 16: 5-6, 7; 18: 2-3, 4-20, 21-24; 19: 18; 21: 3-4. Like their Greek counterpart, they are

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 124.

⁹⁶ See, for example, *The Suppliants*, *The Seven Against Thebes*, *The Libation Bearers*, etc.

⁹⁷ 4: 8, 11; 5: 9, 12, 13, 14; 7: 10, 12; 11: 15, 17-18; 15: 3-4; 19: 1-2, 3-5, 6-8.

⁹⁸ 6: 10.

⁹⁹ 15: 3-4; 19: 2.

¹⁰⁰ 4: 7-8.

¹⁰¹ 4: 4-5.

¹⁰² 6: 9-11; 7: 9ff.

¹⁰³ 6: 15-17.

¹⁰⁴ Haigh, *The Attic Theater*, 3d ed., p. 268.

among the most highly emotional and most profoundly stirring passages of the apocalyptic drama.

The Apocalypse of John is a literary symbol of developing Christianity. The Christianity of the last decade of the first century had its roots in Jewish soil but it also drew light and air and life from the Hellenistic atmosphere. So, too, the Patmos exile embellished his literary framework of apocalyptic thought modeled after Jewish prototypes with an ornamentation drawn from the artistic genius of the Greeks. This fusion of Jewish apocalypse and Greek drama is not only a tribute to the genius of the authors;—it also indicates that Christianity was making its home, not in a new heaven and a new earth, but in the Hellenistic world of its day.

"THE LABYRINTH"

By F. W. BUCKLER, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology

The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World. Edited by S. H. Hooke. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. xiv + 288. \$4.50.

In this volume, the Editor, together with his seven colleagues, has laid scholars still further under his debt in advancing the position already taken up in *Myth and Ritual*, its forerunner. In the earlier volume, the place of the king, in his relation to solar and fertility cults and in the evolution of religion, was worked out. In *The Labyrinth* the development of the argument is continued in the form of a series of studies dealing with offshoots of the cult and the influence of Hellenistic syncretism. Although they are the work of different hands, there is a definite continuity of argument, broken only at one point, and that, unfortunately, the critical point of transition from pre-Christian to Christian. Even there, in Professor E. O. James's opening paragraphs (pp. 237-240), there follows a return to the original theme, making the break less important but none the less regrettable. The main body of the work shows the extent and depth of the influence of kingship in antiquity, and the persistence of the heroic 'myth' (in the sense defined by the Editor in an admirable note, pp. ix-x) in a variety of ritual, literary, and theological forms, into the first and second centuries of the Christian era. It is for this reason that the break in continuity at the opening of Professor James's otherwise useful essay is to be deplored, for it represents the break, in teaching rather than in fact, which has resulted in the loss of anthropological contributions necessary to the understanding of the development of Church History and the history of the idea of the *Regnum Dei* in Christendom.

The opening essay by Mr C. N. Deedes, 'The Labyrinth,'

which gives its name—not inappropriately—to the whole volume, analyses the form of the Labyrinth in Greek myth, and from seals and inscriptions traces its parallel forms in Elam, Egypt, and elsewhere. Taking next the royal tombs and pyramids, he points out the presence of the same elements of complexity in the approach to the innermost shrine. Somewhat unconvincingly (pp. 14, 22) he brushes aside the fear of violation and robbery. This is unnecessary, as its admission would not seriously modify the validity of his argument that 'the Labyrinth was the centre of activities concerned with those greatest of mysteries, Life and Death,' whether it appears in Asia, Africa, or Europe.

Father Eric Burrows' essay 'Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion' is a survey of the place of the temple as the bond of Heaven and Earth, and as the navel of the earth. By a comparison of the views of Sumer and Akkad with those of Babylon and (later) Jerusalem, he shows that in Jerusalem there is a very complete counterpart of Babylon, the parallelism implying not so much Babylonian influence on Jerusalem as a Jewish polemic against Babylonish pretensions. There is no need of a Tower of Babel, for Jerusalem, being set on a hill, is a divinely created ziqqurat. The view has a far more fundamental bearing on the position reflected in the Gospels than the incident of Peter as the rock, indicated by the author. It accounts for the setting of Jerusalem, against Babylon, where Alexander the Great [King] died, as the place where the King, who was to establish on *earth* the Kingdom of *Heaven*, was destined to die, in the heroic setting of the Christian *Shahnamah* and royal saga. In the second part of the study, the writer works out the theological foundations and implications of astrology, and in the third the bearing of the whole on 'the astral eschatology of the Hellenistic Age.'

Babylonian Cosmologies lead directly to the topic of the third essay, 'The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus' by Dr A. R. Johnson. Here the writer develops a theme

which is at last coming into its own, and his conclusions are the same as those already reached by Professor E. R. Goodenough in his essays 'The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship,' (*Yale Classical Studies* I. 55-102) and his less accessible 'Kingship in Early Israel' (*J. B. L.*, Vol. xlviii (1929), pp. 169-205). Neither of these essays is mentioned. The essay opens with the case of David, when his men refused to allow him to go forth any more to battle 'lest thou quench the lamp of Israel' (2 Sam. xxi. 17). He then proceeds to discuss the symbolism of the *NÊR TÂMÎD* or 'perpetual light' of which the King is the embodiment. It may not be out of place to add here a notice of the twin conceptions of the *KA VÔD YAHWÉH* of the Priestly Code and the Magian *Hvarenô Kavaêm*, from the possession of which springs *SEDEK*. This possession is the result of divine gift, and in the Hellenistic Age it passes into the concept of royal wisdom, which is but the Greek form of royal righteousness, and takes the place of the 'reasonable soul' in the King. There is a tendency (pp. 76-7) to overlook this aspect and to throw the *onus* of obedience to the dictates of the social unit on the King. It is true that he joins the gods with men (following Robertson Smith) in the kinship unit, but he does not, even then, make the clear differentiation between 'royal righteousness' and the subject's righteousness; the righteousness which is the source of law, as well as of justice and mercy, and the righteousness which is of obedience to the Law. The conflict is best illustrated in Our Lord's position in opposition to the Pharisees' interpretation of the position He ought to have assumed. The 'corporate personality' of the Kingship, rightly pointed out (p. 75), should not be confused with the 'corporate personality' of the body politic comprising both ruler *and* subject, as in the seventeenth and eighteenth century theories of Natural Law. The 'Kingship' has personality and the king is the head and soul or spirit, as Dr Johnson points out, but it is always clearly differentiated—indeed in virtue of its possession of personality—from the 'subjectdom.'

The discussion of the relation between *Malki-sedek* and *El Elyon* (pp. 81ff) and the relation of the king to the sources of prosperity, culminating in the Feast of Tabernacles (pp. 85ff, 105ff), is a valuable contribution, which lends strength to Schweitzer's argument on the royal significance of the Transfiguration (*Das Abendmahl*, II. Heft (Tübingen 1901), pp. 60ff). A reference to this discussion would have formed an appropriate conclusion to the paragraph (p. 88) showing the parallel between the Babylonian and the Davidic King. The arguments are supported by a liberal selection of passages from the Prophets and the Psalms, as well as from parallel literature. There is a lack of stress, however, on the idea of protection as the main function of the King toward his people, although the material is available in quotations within the essay itself, and the idea of the King as 'the shadow of God on earth.' Nevertheless it would be ungracious to complain, for within the allotted space the writer has given a clear discussion of the essential elements of the royal cult.

The fourth essay is a most welcome study on 'The Cult of Sabazios' from the pen of Professor Oesterley. This study of religious syncretism opens with a useful study of *theocrasia* —the process of bringing together into one mass of divinity the gods of the nations over which the Great King ruled. It is a pity that the writer makes Alexander appear as the *fons et origo* of the movement (p. 116), for, surely, Alexander was but imitating Cyrus, to whom was ascribed the authority of the gods of Sumer and Akkad, Babylon and Jerusalem. No doubt the process increased in intensity in the Hellenistic Age, but to the barbarian Kayan (Achaemenid) belongs the precedence, and even he may have to give to the Neo-Babylonian the meed, the Babylonish Captivity to the contrary notwithstanding. In the second part of the essay, the writer deals with the process of Syncretism among the Jews, and in the third, the Jews of Phrygia, in preparation for his description of the God Sabazios (part iv). Having shown the effect of language in 'snapping the religious link' and produc-

ing 'a new mental outlook' (p. 130), he proceeds to analyse the symbolism of the frescoes, showing the characteristics of Dionysos, Zeus and other deities. The Sabazios hand (part v, pp. 138ff) which is characteristic of the inscriptions is interesting as it was adopted by the Christian Church to symbolize the Holy Trinity (p. 142). After a description of the ritual associated with the god—it is connected with fertility and immortality, as the presence of the snake indicates—Professor Oesterley discusses the eschatology of the cult and its persistence as an illustration of the ritual pattern.

Mr O. S. Rankin's essay, 'The Festival of Hanukkah,' is largely a summary of his longer work *The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah* (1930), and it is devoted to the discussion of a feast of the Jews whose sole reference in the Bible is St John x. 22. The main importance of the essay is to show the way in which the Jewish people transformed an act of Gentile oppression into a festival of praise for Yahweh. Behind the Jewish feast lies a nature ritual, closely resembling the *covan* in the religion of witchcraft (pp. 176ff) and connected with the cult of Apollo. The writer, however, shows the way in which the symbolism and ritual ultimately turn on symbolism and meaning of Kingship, the light being symbolic of the *NÊR TÂMÎD*—or the Kayan Glory.

The Editor's essay, 'The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic,' is in some ways the most suggestive contribution of the whole, for it furnishes the foundation on which the presence of the apocalyptic elements in the Gospels can be accounted for most satisfactorily. After reviewing the relation of the royal cult with fertility, prosperity and, ultimately, with the deity, he shows that the characteristics reappear in the apocalyptic solution to the problem of present evil.

"For the only explanation of the rise of this literature, as distinct from its characteristic form, lies in the fact that it was an attempt, the attempt of a hope creating 'from its own wreck the thing it contemplates,' to vindicate the claim of Israel to be the centre of world-history, and therefore the central object of the purpose of God" (p. 217).

Two elements, then appear: the Messianic element as the future half-human, half-divine *Heil-bringer* and king; the ancient pattern of the king-god banished from his domain to return again as the Messiah in triumph. The writer then proceeds to examine characteristic passages from the Old Testament and from Babylonian literature on the struggle between Marduk and Tiamat, showing the extent to which the figures of beasts and birds, characteristic of apocalyptic literature, reproduce the royal symbolism of the orient. The conclusion is the final victory of the hero-god, the Lamb, and 'the son of man' instead of the Lion and the beast of Babylon.

The suggestion that the reviewer would add to the conclusions of Professor Hooke's valuable essay is that the presence of the apocalyptic element in the Gospels is of the nature, not only of oracles, but also of an historical interpretation of the heroic kingly (Messianic) story, which they contain, *sub specie aeternitatis*. In other words, that it is this element, which constitutes the real 'myth' (strictly in the sense set forth by Professor Hooke) in the Gospels. If this suggestion is acceptable, then the conclusions of the Editor endorse the conclusions of A. von Gall in his *Basileia tou Theou* (1926) and convert one of the most serious difficulties of New Testament interpretation by subordinating its significance to the Cross instead of subordinating the Cross to the eschatological *motif*. In other words, it furnishes the answer to Schweitzer's *Das Abendmahl*.

It is for this reason that we regret the break in the theme introduced by the opening sentences of Professor E. O. James's admirable essay on 'The Sources of Christian Ritual and its relation to the culture Pattern of the Ancient East.' For instance, on p. 238, when he writes, "All this finds its counterpart on a *spiritual* [italics mine] plane in the Messiahship of Christ and the doctrine of the 'Second Adam,'" he really misses the point of the connexion. Instead of 'spiritual,' the word he needs is 'historic,' for it is just this element of the *historic* Messiah, which differentiates the faith of the

earliest Christians from the devotees of the other cults of the ancient world. It is possible for them to continue and, as Professor James shows, to use the existing symbolism, if we might say so, no longer in a merely spiritual sense, for that was already present in the other cults, but with the certainty born of historic assurance. That there were those who recognized the finality of the Cross in the first century is shown by allusions contained in the earliest accounts (vide 'The Meaning of the Cross,' *A. T. R.* xii (1930), pp. 411-422). In the process of time, however, the eschatological hope and apocalyptic figures assumed the lead, and the interpretation usurped the place of the fact.

It is only with the interpretation inherent in the approach, however, that we differ from Professor James, whose wealth of illustration of the royal elements inherent in the developing ritual of the Church and its theology is an important supplement to the more formal theology of the apologists. He gives a salutary warning, in dealing with the ceremonies attendant on coronation (p. 258):

"The original significance of the kingship, however, underwent a process of disintegration when Jesus summed up the essentials of the institution in His own person as the divine Head and Incarnate Lord of the new Kingdom, and, according to Western theology in its Roman form, committed the earthly government of the spiritual realm to His vicegerent, who in his capacity of Vicar of Christ reigned over the Holy Roman Empire as *Pontifex Maximus*."

The concluding essay, 'The Life Giving Myth,' is the work of Mr A. M. Hocart, whose work *On Kingship* (Oxford, 1926) will have prepared the reader for his method and approach. In this paper, he traces the universality of 'the Life Giving Myth,' and, as the Editor points out in the Preface, brings the whole series of studies to their natural conclusion. The foundations of Mr Hocart's views are thoroughly barbarian in the best sense of the term. His strictures on the Hellenic view and the Hellenic heritage to scholarship are most refreshing, and his warning correspondingly salutary (vide pp. 269, 272, 278-9). In few fields has the neglect of such warn-

ing worked greater havoc than in the field of New Testament, where the ready appeal to Hellenism has been made, unmindful of its Hellenic foundation, summed up by Euripides' famous line. It is impossible to follow the writer in his passage from antiquity to modern times and from the Indian in Asia to the Indian in America, but his wanderings bring out three points (1) that the ritual of the life-giving myth is substantially the same throughout the world; (2) that it is always linked up with Kingship; and (3) that the loss of its inner meaning is the fruit of Hellenic *avtárkeia*, which is the heart alike of post-Alexandrian Hellenism and of modern scholarship.

This collection of essays is a noteworthy contribution to the study of the foundations of 'the Kingdom of God on earth,' and their value is in no way limited to the student of the Old Testament. They should form part of the introductory reading of every student of the New Testament and Early Church History. They combine a scholarly caution with a scholarly boldness of thought and form a welcome sequel to *Myth and Ritual*.

BOOK REVIEWS

Bible and Spade, An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology. By Stephen L. Caiger. Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. xii + 218. \$2.00.

To the Old Testament student there is an ever recurring thrill in the emergence of documents amplifying and testifying to the accuracy of material in the Bible. There is, in fact, for this reviewer at least, a most unbiblical desire to flaunt in the face of scoffers at the historical qualities of the Old Testament the annals of Shalmanezer III, Tiglath-Pilezer III and Sargon in particular.

In *Bible and Spade* the author has presented many of the documents most intimately connected with the biblical narratives and interpreted them in relation to the Old Testament material. Beyond this he chronicles the results of many excavations in Palestine and places them according to his own carefully reasoned theories.

These theories, to this reviewer, are inclined to follow Garstang a little more closely than he could wish and to put more credence in Yahuda's works than most American scholars would care to do. The last word on the Exodus and Settlement in Canaan has not yet been said and the rejection of the late date for the former according to these theories is hardly convincing to those who have had the privilege of following T. J. Meek and J. M. P. Smith.

One or two other minor points need some caution. Dr I. J. Gelb of the Oriental Institute has published translations of many of the Hittite hieroglyphs, contrary to Mr Caiger's statement on page 125.

The battle of Karkar is not considered by all scholars the victory for Shalmanezer that the inscription claims. The biblical record would certainly have chronicled a defeat for the hated Ahab and remained silent as it does only if he had been successful. In addition, the rather stereotyped nature of the inscription, the fact that at least four years elapsed before Shalmanezer re-

turned, instead of pressing home his victory at once in Assyrian fashion, all serve to make many students skeptical of his overwhelming victory.

Ashurbanipal's charming garden scene with his wife is just that, except that the head of Tep Humban, ex-king of Elam, his latest victim, grins down from the vines overhead just back of the queen.

Beyond these factors the work is stimulating and refreshing and may well join the similar works of Barton, Mercer, Rogers, James and others on the student's shelves. The bibliography is excellent and the chronological chart really valuable.

ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR.

Die Botschaft von Jesus Christus. By Martin Dibelius. Tübingen: Mohr, 1935, pp. viii + 169. R.M. 2.80.

Dr Dibelius' latest work is a popular presentation of Form Criticism. It is a selection and new translation of representative materials in the gospels. These are grouped in five main divisions, viz. the Early Narratives, Parables, Sayings, the Great Miracle Stories, and Legends. All editorial material supplied by the evangelists, or even by late transmitters of the tradition before it came into the hands of the evangelists, has been omitted. The result is that the material here given is presented in what is presumably its most original form.

Dr Dibelius' main thesis is still his earlier one: the Gospel materials were preserved and handed down because they were used in preaching—as he says somewhere in one of his books, 'In the beginning was the *Sermon!*' The application of this test to the older stories, the parables and sayings is direct and simple. It even applies to the Passion narrative—at least when one leaves out some of the later additions. It is when we come to what Dibelius calls 'the great Miracle Stories' and the 'Legends' that the difficulty of connecting them with Christian preaching becomes serious. However, the author points out the limitations of both these Forms as represented in the gospels. There is a 'worldly' motive at work in the Miracle Stories: what is aimed

at is to represent Jesus as an even greater miracle worker than the popular religious heroes of the Hellenistic world. And yet there can be no question that Jesus actually did appear upon the historical scene as one who performed 'mighty works'; and the aim of these Stories is still to magnify the Jesus who is the subject of Christian preaching. A similar limitation holds the Legends in check. They are not left to go their own way—as, e.g. in the Apocryphal writings of the second and third centuries. Moreover, there were some features in the life of Christ as in the life of every man, at least of every extraordinary man, which could only be portrayed poetically, i.e. by way of legend. Cold photographic prose does not convey the inner spirit as poetry often does, and a legend may convey far more truly the ethos of a time and the attitude of a hero's contemporaries, or even his own inner spirit, than any amount of factually impeccable history.

The last third of the book is taken up with a series of notes on these various Forms and discussions of the materials given in the body of the work.

Students who are concerned to get at the very basis of our knowledge of Jesus and to strip off as far as possible the accretions which have gathered about the earliest tradition might well make a beginning with this attractive little book. Form Criticism has not done away with our knowledge of the historical Jesus; on the contrary, it has brought him and the earliest body of his followers far closer to us than ever before.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

Das vierte Evangelium in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt verdeutscht und erklärt.
By Emanuel Hirsch. Tübingen: Mohr, 1936, pp. 466. M. 6.00; bound, M. 7.50.

The basic interest of this book is religious. It is written with something of the preacher's passion, prompted in this case by the conviction that in the Fourth Gospel we have the essence of Christianity in its most palpable and most authentic form. For our author, laying hold on this essence comes down to two things: knowing what is really meant by Christian faith in Christ as "the

Son" (cp., e.g., p. 138), and recognizing as unchristian anything that savors of Jewish legalism (cp. pp. 102, 141, etc.). It is in this sense that our author has read the Fourth Gospel and found it life-giving, and his commentary is primarily his way of promoting if possible the same understanding and experience in others (*cf.* p. 466).

This does not mean that the book is uncritical. The author is the eminent Professor of Church History and Dean of the Theological Faculty in the University of Göttingen. But the critical underpinning of the book is reserved for separate treatment in another volume soon to follow (*Die Studien zum vierten Evangelium*). Only the barest outline of the author's position on moot points of introduction is given in the present work. The evangelist, it is maintained, must remain for us quite nameless and unknown. We are warranted in inferring however that he was not a Jew, but in all probability a north Syrian Gentile Christian, yet one not without some acquaintance with Aramaic and such knowledge of the Holy Land as a traveler might have acquired any time between 70 and 132 A.D. He was a literary artist of the most accomplished kind. Though laying great store by historical fact (or what in his sources passed for such), he studiously reshapes every historical situation, including the words and deeds of the participants, in such a way as to underline thereby his own understanding of the history.

The most striking feature of Professor Hirsch's book, whether looked at from the critical standpoint or the purely religious, is the author's radical revision of the Johannine text. Regarding the canonical text as the working over of the original Gospel, chiefly in the way of expansion, by an ecclesiastically minded editor of the first half of the second century, our commentator has sought to recover the true text by removing the alleged additions. In the absence as yet of the supplementary volume referred to above it is very difficult to divine the theory underlying many of these excisions, as when, e.g., the removal of 12: 14-16 turns Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem into an entry *on foot!* In a number of instances the unworthy suspicion will not down

that the excisions are related, consciously or unconsciously, to the commentator's own dogmatic prepossessions. Under this head fall a series of verses whose offence would seem to lie in ascribing to Jesus the words "command" or "my commandments" (14: 15, 21; 15: 10-12, 17); three expressions of the universalistic note in the Gospel (10: 16; 11: 52; 17: 20-21); the petitions for unity in the great prayer (17: 11b; 22); and the arresting statement in 4: 22, "Salvation is from the Jews." Can it be that such teaching is not welcomed in certain circles—even Christian circles—of Germany today? Whatever be their offence, the excision of these passages definitely furthers the pronounced anti-Jewish polemic of our commentary, which sees in the contrast of Law and Gospel, whether in the form of Judaism vs. Christianity, or viewed as the Church of the Pope vs. the Church of Luther, an utter and irreducible antinomy.

In the sphere of theology the commentary eschews all flights into metaphysics. Its treatment of Jesus' Person is definitely Ritschlian (*cf.* p. 103). Sacramental language it consistently construes in a non-sacramental sense (*cf.* pp. 187ff).

But in spite of these defects this commentary is full of very genuine religious feeling and sound exegetical insights. There is something permanently valuable for Christian life, and for the right understanding of St. John, in the Ritschlian conception of "Sonship," both Christ's and the believer's (*cf.*, e.g., pp. 138, 160ff); and Christianity is always being threatened from within by the leaven of conventionality and routine, whether you call this leaven Jewish or not (*cf.* pp. 142, 165, 173). The Gospel's delicate and skilful portrayal of individual types of faith is very appealingly presented (as, e.g., in the case of Thomas, pp. 281, 350, 456f), while the nature of the evangelist's own faith could not be better set forth than in the treatment given to Jesus' beatitude in 20: 29. The vexed question of the Gospel's relation to history is most happily handled, and in the commentator's preference of the Synoptic rather than the Johannine chronology of the Passion, now becoming increasingly rare, the reviewer finds him at one with himself.

An idiosyncrasy irritating to the student is the abandonment of the familiar chapter and verse divisions of the text for an arrangement of the commentator's own consisting of 48 sections whose numbers, when used for reference, connote simply nothing to the ordinary reader's mind.

CHARLES B. HEDRICK.

Origenes Werke. Vol. X. *Origenes Matthäuserklärung:* i. *Die Griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi.* Ed. by Erich Klostermann. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1935, pp. xiii + 304. R.M. 24.

The eleventh volume of the Works of Origen was published in 1933. It contained the Latin translation of the *Commentariorum Series* drawn from his Commentary on the Gospel of St Matthew. The present volume (no. x) contains the surviving books of the original Greek work, together with the surviving Latin translation of these passages. Only Books x-xvii survive from the twenty-five Tomoi of the original. There are two manuscripts of real importance though late in date (13th and 14th Centuries) and the Latin has often to be consulted since the text has gone astray at many points. However, the Latin has had its own history, and though very early, was probably never a literal translation of the Greek. It was quite unfeasible therefore to print only the Greek with a collation of the Latin in the apparatus. Perhaps as often as not the Greek original underlies the Latin rather than the present Greek.

Dr Klostermann has succeeded the late Erwin Preuschen in the task of editor and has had at his disposal photographic reproductions of the two manuscripts, now at Munich and at Cambridge. Dr Klostermann does not follow Harnack, Zahn, and others who hold that there were two editions of the original—compare Blass's theory of the Western Text of Luke-Acts. Klostermann thinks that the two texts, the Latin and the Greek, diverged steadily over a long period of time.

Perhaps the most significant feature of this new edition—which ranks easily as a definitive edition of the work—is the use which it makes of the Latin version. Curiously the first modern

editor, Merlin (1512), paid no attention to the Greek, while the first editor of the Greek, Huet (1668), made little use of the Latin save in passages where almost any variant would be of some help. So little did he think of the Latin that he even provided the Greek with a parallel translation of his own. The same procedure was followed by De la Rue in the Maurinist edition in 1740, reprinted by Migne. Later editors abandoned both the ancient and the modern Latin translation. It is a decided advantage that in the new Berlin Academy edition now before us both the Greek and the ancient Latin versions have come into their own side by side, with a careful modern editing of each.

Part 3 of this edition of Origen's Commentary on Matthew will contain the Fragments, the Preface, and the Indexes, and will appear perhaps next year.

It is the aim of the series, *Die Griechischen Christl. Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, to include all the written documents of early Christianity, that is of the first three centuries. The extent of the edition will be fifty volumes. The present volume is the fortieth.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Christian Life in the Middle Ages and Other Essays. By F. M. Powicke. Oxford: University Press, 1935, pp. 168. \$3.50.

Six of these eight papers have been already printed. The two exceptions are the one on "Dante and the Crusade" and the one on "Medieval Education." The first of these will prove of interest to the student of the Crusades rather than to the Dante enthusiast perhaps, for Dante, as is pointed out, merely "took for granted the current view of the Crusade." In the paper on "Medieval Education" the author not only gives a splendid brief summary of the subject, but, through the mouth of the medieval 'educator' offers a criticism of modern education which deserves to be remembered. Among other things the medieval teacher says, "Nor do I understand you when you talk about progress, for you seem to mix up growing in justice and peace and ability to live a life of reason and intellectual pleasure with

so many other things, and you seem to have the most curious ideas about what the end of it all is. You seem to leave God out." We have here, I think, part of the answer to a question asked in another of these essays, the one on "The Christian Life in the Middle Ages." "How did the medieval Church maintain a hold so hardly won in early times, so easily lost in our own?" The medieval Church, like the educators she produced, has some very clear ideas about "what the end of it all is" and did not "leave God out."

Even those who already possess most of these essays will want to own the book. In spite of subjects as far apart as "Loretta, Countess of Leicester" and "Boniface VIII" the collection has a real unity. Christian life in the middle ages had unity, though not monotony. One is sometimes tempted to feel that much modern religious life has lost unity and achieved monotony.

W. F. WHITMAN.

A History of the American Episcopal Church. By William Wilson Manross. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1935, pp. xviii + 404. \$2.75.

For a good many years we have been hard put to it to find a satisfactory history of the Episcopal Church. The only easily available book, short sketches excepted, is distinguished by brilliance rather than by accuracy or restraint of historical judgment—pleasant reading but frequently untrustworthy. Archdeacon Tiffany's scholarly but somewhat heavy volume in the "American Church History" series stops with the 'Quadrilateral' and the Prayer Book revision of 1892. Such a book as the Manross *History* is the more welcome because so long overdue.

In his treatment of the colonial jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, the commissioners, the ecclesiastical functions of the crown governors, the efforts made toward securing the episcopate for the colonial churches, and the colorful controversies to which these efforts gave rise, Mr Manross has improved greatly upon his predecessors. His debt here to Prof. Cross's *Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* is evident and acknowledged. Missions and Church extension are generally well handled, al-

though some significant points—in connection with California, for example—are unfortunately omitted. The statement (p. 264) about Horatio Southgate is quite misleading. Objective treatment of the frictions and party conflicts which followed in the wake of the Oxford Movement and the ceremonial revival is always difficult to attain. Mr Manross has done this with lucidity and commendable fairness.

Useful as the book will undoubtedly prove by reason of its factual content and its freedom from partisanship, we can hardly feel that Mr Manross has made the most of his opportunity. Too frequently denominational historians write as if a church lived its life *in vacuo*, little influenced by surrounding culture or contemporary movements at large. Mr Manross has not freed himself from this narrowing tendency, which can only obscure understanding. Pages are devoted to local history of merely antiquarian interest when they might have been more profitably spent on background or on the interpretation of crucial events. Mr Manross seems afraid of contrasting lights and shades. Thus the deep differences between New England churchmanship and the churchmanship of the "South" in the period of organization are not sufficiently underlined; the significance of the General Convention of 1835, when the hampering 'federal principle' was transcended, is underemphasized; and the Memorialist movement receives inadequate treatment. This failure to bring really important issues into proper relief is perhaps the most serious weakness of the volume. Significant trends are hidden behind a multiplicity of detail.

When so much space is given to items of local history of no particular consequence—and this rather spottily—and to names of altogether inconspicuous individuals, one is surprised to find not the least mention of the only distinguished Anglican dignitary to visit these shores in the colonial period—George Berkeley. Yet Berkeley's Newport sojourn is in its way one of the most important episodes in the history of the colonial Church. The bibliography, likewise, has some strange omissions.

If the author had displayed an imagination equal to his honesty

and his diligence in the mastery of facts he might have given us precisely the sort of book we have been waiting for.

P. V. NORWOOD.

Value and Existence. By N. O. Lossky and John S. Marshall. London: Allen & Unwin, 1935, pp. 223. 7s. 6d.

Professor Lossky, distinguished Russian Christian Neo-Platonist, contributes Part I; Professor Marshall, an American who agrees with him and interprets him, contributes a preface and Part II. In brief compass, the book is of the well-rounded world-view type, which is not the favorite sort for English writers. It reminds one of the schematic perfection of Münsterberg's *Eternal Values*.

Philosophy of value, among writers in English, is very slow and uncertain in coming clear: we have been at it a good while, but have not yet won even clarity as to the issues (see Ward, *Philosophy of Value*). It is good to have glimpses, in this book, of luminous German value-philosophies, from the subjectivism of Ehrenfels on toward greater objectivity in Kreibig, Meinong, Heyde, and especially Scheler and N. Hartmann. (You can get Hartmann in English.) They go all the way from 'value is created by the valuer' to 'feeling of value is a mode of cognition of the real world.' After a brief survey of these, the authors' positive thesis appears—thoroughly objective, with the objectivity not of natural science but rather of theology.

"Positive value is existence in its significance for approaching God and the Divine fulness of being" (57). Not all existents are positively good; all are free, and some have refused to be all that they could be; but 'God' means the absolute Existent, or Fulness of Being, and this coincides with perfection of value. (Sometimes, I think, Prof. Lossky needs the word 'existent' where he uses 'existence,' and Prof. Marshall uses the terms better: 80, 95, 203.) All things have been created out of nothing rather than out of God, but by God and *unto* God (though it is confusing to say "God made the whole world out of nothing and projected it from his own being," 12). All things have free-

dom, and all have something like souls (no mere artefacts); their proper movement is to fuller existence, all the way to God as perfect fulness of being. All things have freedom, but are also mutually interrelated and interpenetrate, in fact and of necessity, throughout the universe ('abstract consubstantiality'). Attainment of value means progressing from this to 'concrete consubstantiality,' from inevitable to voluntary and generous sharing of one's substance with all other selves, thus indefinitely approaching the divine consubstantiality and perichoresis in which the three Persons of the Trinity share perfectly everything that they have, are, and do. (The philosophy is far more Trinitarian than Incarnational. We should prefer to have it both; but it is as welcome as it is rare to find the 'social analogy' of the Trinity preferred to the 'psychological analogy' and used with confidence and success, the Trinity being viewed as the infinite 'type of what communal life of persons may be' —209.)

This view of the universe as a tremendous whole wherein each individual is an intrinsically valuable end, whose fulness of self-realization, however, is to be found in utter sharing of all with all, as members, has much in common with Hegelianism, but with more radical difference between good and evil and more need of striving to attain perfection or 'deification'; with the organic philosophy, but with more perfect transcendence in actuality of the Perfect One; with the scholastic philosophy of Form, and with so many variants of 'holism' that its fundamental notes may seem almost commonplace—all the better assurance of being on the main line toward the truth. Perhaps the most distinctive statement, that "value is existence in its significance for approaching God" places value more truly than other philosophies, as not simply created by us, and not simply created ready-made for us, but existent *and* perfectible if we will have it so.

There is a 'novel,' 'unique' theory of consciousness: "When rightly thinking the nature of an object, that object as intellectual form is actually immanent in my mind" (163). This is certainly not straight Neo-Platonism, though perhaps it is a 'transfigured Neo-Platonism'; whether it is entirely unique may be doubted.

We must note two matters most liable to criticism. There seems to be an excessive vitalism, 'panvitalism,' or 'hierarchical personalism,' which 'takes every existence to be a living being,' with 'purposive, creative activity' (95). "In nature everything is permeated with subjective being. Everywhere, wherever there is *something*, necessarily there is also *somebody* present." (M. B. Foster, in *Mind* for Oct. 1935, says that this Greek idea is contrary to science and to the Christian doctrine of creation.)

And there is, we think, excessive use of such words as 'super-personal,' 'super-qualitative,' and even 'super-essential.' "The Absolute has an existence that is completely independent of the created world. The Absolute has neither essence nor value. It is super-essential and timeless; It is beyond the realm of value. But . . . It has a life" (178). This sounds more like a Pseudo-Dionysian hymn of praise than an exposition of anything to be believed.

The structure of Reality as here delineated is richly concrete, majestic, superb. This may not be a great book, but it is a most impressive introduction to a great world-view.

M. B. STEWART.

What Religion Is and Does. By Horace T. Houf. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935, pp. viii + 373. \$3.00.

Mr Houf, who belongs to the Philosophy Department of Ohio University, has written a book which is apparently an attempt to provide a text-book for a 'survey course in religion.' This will be welcomed as a useful book to put in the hands of college freshmen and sophomores, thoroughly reliable in the most part, but subject to the limitations of any work attempting to treat such a broad field.

The book is divided into two main portions, 'Generic Religion,' and 'Hebrew-Christian Religion.' In the first part, Mr Houf begins with 'what religion is' and then turns to 'what it does.' Not all religions, perhaps, perform the functions which Mr Houf suggests that they do, and one feels that the author has the Christian religion primarily in mind. More account might be taken of Mohammedanism, Hinduism, and Buddhism.

The author shows good acquaintance with religious and philosophical movements of the present day. He is not under the spell of psychology and realizes that the psychologists are not omniscient, but he gives due weight to their findings. His apologetic—for it practically amounts to that—draws largely on Lloyd Morgan's doctrine of emergent evolution. His arguments for the existence of God, in chapter X, are from 'evolution and progress' (the cosmological?), from 'religious experience' (*e consensu gentium?*), 'morals and values' (the moral?), from 'the existence of persons,' from 'the intelligible world' (which perhaps corresponds roughly to the teleological), and the 'pragmatic argument.' He rejects revelation as a separate source of religious knowledge, while appealing to religious experience. He concludes that God is limited (pp. 170f).

His treatment of prayer, to be more systematic, should distinguish between the *types* of prayer, viz. confession, adoration, etc., and the *forms* of prayer, ejaculation, meditation, etc.

In dealing with the Bible, Mr Houf assumes that J and E are absolutely separate documents; a view that is in process of being modified today. One wonders whether he distinguishes properly between particularism and universalism in Judaism. He adopts the multiple source theory of the Synoptic Gospels. Mark is written by John Mark and Q by the Apostle Matthew. His treatment of our Lord's life is good. He follows largely the Marcan framework, using some details from Luke. He would be classified as a moderate apocalypticist.

The chapter on 'Christianity' is analytical and yet positive and appreciative, and the one on 'the Church and its Divisions' is fair and balanced.

In places the style is pedestrian, and authorities are nearly always referred to, even in the text, as 'J. H. Jones,' 'A. B. Smith,' rather than an occasional 'Professor Jones,' 'Canon Smith,' a habit which tends to monotony. But these are only small flaws in a worthwhile piece of work.

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON.

The Mystical Body of Christ. By Fulton J. Sheen. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935, pp. 404. \$2.50.

From an Anglican point of view this book is an interesting mixture. Part of it is excellently done—sane, logical, and persuasive. Parts of it are poetically appealing but not altogether convincing. Some of it demands Roman Catholic presuppositions which will not be present with many of its readers.

It is a study of the nature of the Church succinctly stated in the Introduction: "The Church is no longer on the defensive; she is no longer on the offensive; she is on the descriptive." The author assumes that the responsibility of maintaining the Faith rests upon the shoulders of Roman Catholics because "Protestantism in great part has ceased to be Christian."

The doctrine of the Church here presented rests upon the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord. He fulfilled His mission through the agency of a human body. His mission is perpetuated through the Mystical Body which is the Church. What His human body was to Christ in His humanity, that the Mystical Body is to the glorified Christ. Every body must have a head and Christ is the Head of the Mystical Body. But the Mystical Body has its visible expression which is the Church at work in the world and this also must have a visible head. Hence the Vicar of Christ and the successors of St Peter. Christ is the Head, baptized Christians are the body, and the Holy Spirit is the Soul of the Church. Our Lord did not promise impeccability to the Church but He did guarantee infallibility which means "Divine assistance for the prevention of error." Revelation is one thing, inspiration is another, and infallibility is something else again. It is not a tap through which truth may be poured forth but a dam which restrains heresy. Divine Truth lives in the Church and the Holy Father is its mouthpiece. When he speaks as such, it is Christ speaking. Because of her Divine authority, the Church must be intolerant—tolerant toward persons, to be sure, but intolerant as to principles. In communicating His Life through the Church, our Lord uses persons and things—which is the background of the priesthood and the sacramental system. The individual

Christian does not stand alone in his relationship to God but is part of the corporate experience of a Christian society. This carries on into the Church Expectant in Purgatory and the Church Triumphant in Heaven. St Mary is the Mother of our Lord and the Church is part of the fulness of Christ—therefore Mary is also the Mother of the Church and in the mediation of God's grace stands second only to Christ. Through the Mass all these spiritual blessings become applicable to Christian people and the Eucharist is the center of Christian unity. The faithful are called upon to practice the doctrines here set forth, thereby gradually leavening the world to a Christian standard. This is the meaning of true "Catholic Action."

The book is well written and, on the whole, presents a positive thesis rather than argumentative or polemical. The only exception to this is to be found in two or three instances where criticism is cast upon the Anglican communion. For example a point is made of the "Black Rubric" but nothing is said to indicate its brief and ineffective life and its repeal long ago.

The chapters propounding the doctrines about the Papacy, Purgatory, and the Blessed Virgin might be called the weak points of the book. The treatment of St Mary is almost entirely sentimental. The exposition of Purgatory, reparation, and the treasury of merits is a mechanical rationalization. The exaltation of the Papacy follows the usual lines but again evades one crucial point which always does seem to be evaded. In one place Fr Sheen assures us that St Peter was Prince of the Apostles and that the Bishops of Rome, as his successors, are the heirs of the divine authority given to him by our Lord (p. 105). In another place he propounds the familiar doctrine of Apostolic Succession—that life can come only from life, that the Church as the bearer of divine authority must have a living connection with Christ through the Apostles, and that "there is only one Church in the world to-day which claims to be apostolic" (*sic*; p. 132). How can the two things be made to mesh? The Pope is dead before his successor can even be chosen and no one remains possessed of Petrine authority to convey it to another. Papal

authority seems to destroy the principle of Apostolic Succession.

However, there is so much of sound value in the book that one does not wish to be too critical. It is becoming more and more clear that the question of the nature of the Church lies at the bottom of all discussion on Church Unity. Anyone interested in the reuniting of Christendom would do well to read this book.

FRANK E. WILSON.

The Church Against the World. By H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck, Francis Miller. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1935, pp. 156. \$2.00.

The three essays that make up this book have to do with the place of the Church in the modern world. Dr Pauck of the Chicago Theological Seminary discusses the critical situation in which religious belief finds itself today. Humanism and Modernism, he says, have failed to meet the problem. The Barthians offer more help because they insist that we take God seriously but their theology is not inclusive enough to provide an entirely satisfactory solution.

Francis Miller of the World Student Christian Federation points out that Protestants having freed themselves from Rome are now in the process of being enslaved by their respective national cultures. "In the great days of the Protestant movement," he says, "the Protestant churches lived within the framework of Christendom. That was a gift which they had received from Rome." Nationalism which in its acute form is a development of the last one hundred years has broken down any sense of unity which may have existed among the Protestant churches. The consciousness of Christendom has been lost. Where can the Protestant church find a rallying point? Not in the Bible, Mr Miller says, and not in a new world culture (the authors of *Rethinking Missions* to the contrary) because owing to the exploitation of National States there is no prospect of a world culture emerging. "The domestication of Protestantism within national cultures is steadily taking place." In the United States he sees coming a national religion as opposed to the Christian religion. The high priest of the movement which is preparing

the way for such a national religion, according to Mr Miller, is Professor John Dewey, who finds the meaning of life in the "unification of the self through allegiance to inclusive ideal ends which imagination presents to us." Man's social environment conditions his imagination more than any other factor and for most of us Professor Dewey's principle would mean domination by the culture in which we are living. We need something to lift us outside of and above our cultural environment. Mr Miller concludes that American Protestantism must attempt to re-create among its members belief in the reality of Christendom, which means "preoccupation with those elements in the Christian faith that have an absolute and eternal value"—a belief in God, in the divine drama of salvation and in the Christian Church "as a catholic community of faith."

In the third essay in the book Dr H. R. Niebuhr, Professor of Christian Ethics at Yale, points out that the history of the relation of the Christian Church to civilization has been marked by periods of conflict, alliance, and identification. A converted church in a corrupt world keeps clear of worldly entanglements while it tries to convert the world. Apparent success comes, the church relaxes its rigors, faith loses its force, and finally the church becomes identified with the secular culture. Then the secular culture becomes corrupt and in its corruption carries the church along with it. When this happens the only salvation for the church is to declare war against the world once more and start over again. The church went through this cycle in its early days and again at the time of the Reformation. We are now at the stage where the church has become identified with the world again and has become corrupt with it. The church is in bondage to capitalism, to nationalism and to humanism. The time for a new withdrawal, for a new conflict is at hand if the church is to be true to itself.

This is a disquieting book and, therefore, an important book. The authors analyze very clearly the problems which confront the church in our day but they are too honest to suggest any cheap and easy solution where no cheap and easy solution is to be found.

If the authors' analysis is correct, as I believe it is, certainly the Anglican Church has a contribution to make to the solution to the problem. Whatever else it may lack, its allegiance to the Church Universal gives it that sense of the importance of Christendom which Mr Miller seeks. On the other hand, while it may not be as deeply involved in humanism as some of the Protestant churches, it is certainly involved in capitalism and nationalism. If it can free itself from these entanglements and fare forth, loyal on the one hand to its sense of being an organic part of the Holy Catholic Church and loyal on the other hand to Jesus Christ and His spirit of service and sacrifice, it may well provide the rallying point of the church of the future.

C. L. STREET.

Preface to a Christian Sociology. By Cyril E. Hudson. London: Allen and Unwin, 1935, pp. 136. 4s. 6d.

Canon Hudson of St Alban's is well known in this country as Lecturer at Berkeley Divinity School and Hale Preacher at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. He is also known for his volumes of *Outlines of Teaching Sermons*.

In the present volume he comes to close grips with the whole question of the vocation of the Church in the modern world. He belongs to the school—if it be a school—of Maurice Reckitt, W. G. Peck, and V. A. Demant. Canon Hudson recognizes that sacramentalism is fundamental not only to the Christian view, but to any sane understanding of society as a whole. He does not hesitate to carry through this principle into its fullest ethical applications.

"It is too often assumed that the hallmark of a Christian is that he should 'give up' things. It is argued, for instance, that, in the present distress, when this world's goods are so inequitably distributed, it is the plain duty—and the *whole* duty—of those who have possessions, to surrender them to be shared by those who have none. Such renunciation is often taken to provide a completely satisfactory answer to the question, 'What can we do about it?'"

As against this narrow conception the author points out the indispensable requirement of an exercise of stewardship: the

Christian must use, not renounce this world's goods, and must use them for those ends for which God in fact created them.

The chapter on 'The Spiritual Resources of Secularism' is a very penetrating and riddling analysis of the great modern alternative to Christianity.

"Civilisation's rejection of the Christian doctrine of man as a supernatural being, with his origin and destiny in the eternal world, has had the effect, not of increasing, but of belittling his significance. To make man the measure of all things is to reduce him in the end to the level of the small and trivial."

Canon Hudson sees perfectly clearly the issue before the Church. Toward a solution of the social and economic problems of today, the Church may not seem to have much directly to offer. It may also seem, especially to some members of the Church, that the 'Church's ethic' is more or less antiquated on some points —this we freely admit. On the other hand, it seems perfectly clear that a civilisation which has neither an understanding philosophy nor a compelling faith is not likely to get far in solving its own problems. And so, even though some of the detailed applications of Christian ethic need revision in the line of modern knowledge and adaptation to modern conditions, the main position seems sound, viz. the supremacy of spiritual values, the important theory that work is good not as an end in itself, and not as a means to acquisition of profits, but in the service of the true wants of human life which are its preservation, health, enrichment —rather than the mere accumulation of things, whether in the hands of the many or the few. It is a long time since some of our social philosophers took seriously the plain implications of the Christian Gospel, and it is perhaps time that some of these implications were carefully studied—and not only by social philosophers, either.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

Normative Psychology of Religion. By Henry Nelson Wieman and Regina Westcott-Wieman. New York: Crowell, 1935, pp. vii + 564. \$3.50.

In this book, Professor Wieman, in collaboration with his wife, a consulting psychologist, attempts a full and complete treatment

of the implications of psychology for religion. As its title suggests, the function of psychology is not to be thought of as merely describing religious phenomena, but must also seek to provide for the development of religion in accordance with definite norms. A survey is first made of present influences upon religion, which is followed by a presentation of the authors' peculiar type of religious realism. It is this underlying impersonal conception of religion, which refuses to recognize anything of personality in the idea of God, which makes the book hard and somewhat disappointing reading from the point of view of a Churchman. "Religion, at its highest and best, is the devotion of the total self, through search, service and adoration, to the highest cause of which one is now conscious, providing that cause is deemed worthy of the devotion of all men, and is symbolic of ever higher unexplored values" (p. 29). The fundamental elements in religion are devotion and value. God is that superhuman reality which promotes growth of value in the world. He is the supreme value. "Supreme value is the greatest actual and possible connection between activities which makes them mutually sustaining, mutually enhancing, and mutually meaningful" (p. 51). "God is the *growth* of meaning and value in the world" (p. 137). Jesus is the incarnation of this.

Religion involves the whole of life. An excellent analysis of the social situation makes it clear that the world must somehow be remade. To accomplish this radical but necessary change, religion, social sciences, and politics can and must cooperate. The Church itself must be radically changed. In particular, the Church's philosophy and normative psychology of religion must be wholly revised, and it must provide a creative fellowship and an enriching heritage of religious meditation and insight.

The book as a whole is difficult to read. It is often too coldly abstract; there is little warmth in it. It will, however, receive a glad welcome, for it is often arrestingly suggestive. It discusses almost every conceivable practical religious problem, e.g. the problems of faith, mysticism, prayer, forgiveness; and its analyses are penetrating and always clear-cut. Its three indexes (of

authors, subjects, and definitions), together with the reading lists at the conclusions of the chapters, make it one of the most useful reference books on the psychology of religion that we now possess.

PAUL S. KRAMER.

Christian Living Series. Primary First Year Course and Junior First Year Course. By Lala C. and Leon C. Palmer. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1935. Teacher's Manual, 75c. Pupil's Leaflets, 25c per quarterly set.

These two courses are the first year Primary and the first year Junior courses in the Christian Living Series of Church School texts. The first and second year Kindergarten courses have already appeared.

The Christian Living Series is planned in the first instance for the department graded school, although when the entire course is completed it may be used as conveniently in a closely graded school.

The first year Primary course, *Learning About God*, aims to lead the child into a growing awareness of God as an unseen but ever-present friend who is vitally concerned with his total welfare, and in the growing knowledge of whom the child will develop a joyous and useful personality. The basic technique is story-telling, the material for which is drawn from the Bible, the lives of some well-known saints and leaders, and from the rich treasure-house of myth, fable and folk-lore. There is good correlation with the Church Year, the Prayer Book and the Hymnal. Adequate and well-planned project work is included. The pupil's leaflets are attractive, clearly printed, and their colored illustrations are generally very good. The teacher's manual gives a brief, well-ordered lesson plan for each week. An excellent feature of the teacher's manual is a section containing a series of self-examinations for teachers, explanations of some difficult theological concepts, an outline of the play-life of the primary child, and some first-class advice to parents.

The first year Junior course, *Citizens of the Kingdom of God*, likewise utilizes the story-telling method. The chief source of

material is the lives of Bible heroes. The object of the course is to help the child to appreciate what the Kingdom of God is and what are the obligations and privileges of membership in the Kingdom. There is correlation with the Prayer Book and the Hymnal, and an adaptation of the "Code of a Good American," widely used in secular schools, is used effectively. The set-up of both teacher's manual and pupil's leaflets are similar to those of the Primary course. Two principal defects of the first year Junior course are the absence of planned project work and the omission of the valuable appendix of teachers' and parents' helps.

These two courses represent a very marked improvement in almost every way over the Kindergarten courses offered in this series. The present texts are among the best that have yet appeared under any auspices, and are certainly superior to anything that has yet been published within the Episcopal Church. The simplicity of the individual lessons, the omission of lengthy reference material, the reliance upon the story-telling method, the correlation with Prayer Book and Hymnal, and the careful classification and outline of each lesson are features that will appeal to every Church School teacher.

H. RALPH HIGGINS.

Convictions and Controversies. By Ralph Adams Cram. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1935, pp. viii + 282. \$2.50.

Many of us regret the barrenness of an age without a Pater, a Charles Lamb, an Emerson, or a Stevenson. What is desired is not the clever school of a Chesterton or a Mencken, the latter almost trite in his avoidance of any values except his own, but a school of essayists combining deep learning, wide sympathy, high idealism and beauty of English prose. What we miss is a beauty of mind and heart shining through beauty of expression.

To those with this kind of intellectual hunger, the present work of Ralph Adams Cram should appeal especially. Backed by a life-time of culture, of wide travel, of extensive reading, of the most notable and creditable success in his own art, this great archi-

tect of things in stone would draught a plan for a better world for men.

They are simple rules that he makes his foundation : return to a religion based upon the sacraments—continual reminders of Christ's sacrifice for mankind—and the constant use of the test of beauty.

"Bring then the test of beauty to bear, not alone on what offers itself as contemporary art in so many of its forms, but equally, and even primarily, on the theories and principles of contemporary life and culture and civilization ; on philosophy and religion, on social customs and political principles and devices, on economic, industrial and commercial systems, above all on the multitudinous panaceas that now beat upon us with such confusing insistence. Test them and gauge them, accept them or reject, in accordance with their beauty or their ugliness. So, and only so, can you recover the inherent truth from its crushing strata of falsity, give back its native vitality, ensure a following age of greatness and nobility, and avert the calamity, now envisaged but, by the grace of God and the courage and will of this generation, easily to be set aside."

The particular *bête noire* of the author is the complacent acceptance of the principle of progressive evolution, that everything gets better, and is bound to do so, merely by moving along. Evolution, he insists, must be recognized as potentially retrogression quite as much as progression. It is a wicked thing to consider all change for the better. To every change there must be applied the *Ordeal of Beauty*.

In form the book is made up of essays principally printed in periodicals. The 'Convictions' are The Oxford Movement and Public Worship, The Educational Value of Beauty, Challengers of Democracy, The New Middle Ages, Ordeal by Beauty, and Christian Unity.

'Controversies' are: Why We Do Not Behave Like Human Beings, Recovery or Regeneration, The Mystery of Sakkarah, Radio City—and After, Beyond the Nemesis, and Post Caesarem

Quid. In addition, three Belles Lettres, *The Last of the Squires*, *White Magic*, and *Fulfillment*.

In two of these latter we learn all we need to know of the author's inheritance to add to what we already know of his life and achievements. '*The Last of the Squires*,' an utterly charming study of his mother's father, reveals the source of his unchangeable senses of values and principles. In '*Fulfillment*,' his Unitarian Clergyman father through his childhood clothes him in the garments of balance and breeding of Emerson's New England.

ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR.

To the Editor of the REVIEW.

Exception has most properly been taken to a statement of mine in review of Dr Louis Wallis's *God and the Social Process* in this REVIEW, 1935, p. 251. In discussing the author's use of *baal*, *baalism*, etc. I remarked that "that villainous upstart Abimelek of Judges is lauded as representing the higher social idea when he massacred all the *ba'alim* of Shechem." Now on p. 82 of his book Dr Wallis had already characterized Abimelek in much the same language—as "an adventurer," who "hired a band of gangsters" and "murdered the sons of Gideon," some seventy persons. I had Dr Wallis's characterization in mind when I characterized Abimelek. I was absolutely wrong in saying that he lauded the fellow himself. But my particular reference was to the end of the story, when, vv. 32ff, the Shechemites becoming weary of his tyranny, Abimelek "went over to his relatives in the house of Joseph and called into action the peasantry of Ephraim, who in a revolutionary uprising destroyed the city and slew the entire population, 'about a thousand men and women'" (so Dr Wallis, p. 83). On the same page he describes the Josephites as possessed with 'the primitive *mishpat*' which *mishpat* he constantly extols as over against *baalism*. But the uprising of this *mishpat*-folk with the massacre of a thousand citizens (*ba'alim*) goes uncondemned. My mind was interested in inquiring whether this massacre of a thousand citizens along with the renewed triumph of the tyrant represented "a higher social idea." But my sincere apology is due to Dr Wallis for my actual language, and I trust that the Editor of the REVIEW will do me the grace of printing this.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

Feb. 18, 1936.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Old Testament; Judaism

The Hebrew Heritage, A Study of Israel's Cultural and Spiritual Origins. By Charles W. Harris. Abingdon Press, 1935, pp. 370. \$2.50.

A scant couple of generations ago the Hebrews were studied as if in a vacuum. The Old Testament was a peculiar book, either true as to every word or a fairy story in its entirety, according to the point of view.

Today, theoretically, we have left that stage of arbitrary decisions far behind. We are quite inured to the documentary theory, the oral tradition. We look on higher criticism with a mild wonder, it is true, rather like watching a rabbit brought from a hat, but we are trained to accept the expert's opinion. We are even a little blasé about the Moabite Stone, the Black Obelisk of Shalmanezer and the Code of Hammurabi. We accept the Sunday newspaper's amazing identification of a statue of King David or the palace of the Queen of Sheba with altogether too little skepticism. We look to Archaeology with interest to provide us with our daily addition to the knowledge of the Hebrews and their book.

It is in the use of materials long available that the modern scholar fails. It is still quite possible to take a course in Old Testament and never know that while Nehemiah was rebuilding the walls of ruined Jerusalem, Pericles was building the new Athens; to read Ezra's political theory and neglect the possible implications of the contemporary Socrates or Plato; to realize that the period of Second Isaiah's ministry was that of the Buddha and Confucius and Lao Tze in the far east and of Zoroaster's followers just over the mountains to the east of Babylon.

To provide against this lack, Dr Harris has written this really exceptional book. We see Egypt, Babylonia, Greece, Persia pouring their treasures into the melting pot of the Fertile Crescent, the land bridge which is Palestine and Syria. Best of all, Old Testament material is actually treated in the light of the contemporary material. In particular, the prophets are brought into true perspective.

Much of the material from these other regions is presented in full and thus the work offers a storehouse of pertinent material readily available.

The work is primarily aimed at the general Old Testament reader rather than the scholar. It is none too technical and relatively elementary criticism is explained so as to be readily understandable. The work, nevertheless, is suggestive to the Old Testament scholar to almost as great a degree. In the suggested organization of material alone the book is well worth possessing.

A. D. A., JR.

Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Volume XV for 1934-35.
Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1935, pp. viii + 202. \$2.50.

There is something of the sensation of being on the actual firing line to one reading an *Annual of the American Schools*, as there is with the Quarterlies. The editors succeed remarkably well in giving the impression of news hot off the griddle. Last year, for example, when a Seminary student was writing a history of Bethel, the arrival of the quarterlies containing the latest accounts of that excavation were awaited as eagerly as any magazine with a continued story.

This fifteenth volume is true to the tradition. It carries on Dr Glueck's survey expedition south of Judah and in the deserts of Edom and Moab. It provides a fascinating travel narrative as well as aiding this student, at any rate, to a sense of the atmosphere of Palestine's outskirts, a region known but little even to the traveller in the Holy Land.

Most valuable, however, is the series of conclusions reached by the author. Roughly these were as follows: Edom and Moab had flourishing civilizations but only in sharply delimited periods. These were from the twenty-third to the eighteenth centuries and from the thirteenth to the eighth. Here again may be seen the unity of the East. In these eddies off the main stream a high civilization is brought to a pause exactly as in Babylonia and in Egypt during the eighteenth century. The author asks pertinently, "Were the Hyksos responsible," or were, perhaps, the Kassites the guilty ones? The eighth century breakoff bears tragic witness to the truth of Tiglath-Pilezer III's annals, or does it offer dramatic proof of the story of Amaziah's smiting of Edom in II Kings? Either conjecture is interesting.

A. D. A., JR.

The Coverdale Psalter and the Quatocentenary of the Printed English Bible.
By Harold R. Willoughby. Printed for the Caxton Club, Chicago, 1935.
\$15.00.

A very attractive photographic reprint of the Psalter from Myles Coverdale's English Bible, first published in 1535. To this Dr Willoughby has prefaced an interesting and informing account of the production of the first English Psalter and also of the life of Coverdale. The volume is a very attractive souvenir of the 400th anniversary of Coverdale's Bible.

The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts. By James A. Montgomery and Zellig S. Harris. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1935.

An edition with Glossary of the famous Ras Shamra texts, published as vol. iv of the *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* held at Philadelphia.

Denkmäler Palästinas: Eine Einführung in die Archäologie des Heiligen Landes. Band II. By Carl Watzinger. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1935, pp. viii + 169 + 40 plates. M. 9.

Professor Watzinger here completes the task, begun in the first part of this work published two years ago, of bringing together in systematic form the

results of the recent exploration and excavation of Palestine. In this volume he describes the archaeological remains of the centuries from the beginning of the cultural influence of Assyria to the end of the Byzantine epoch. The four chapters deal successively with the period of foreign domination, the reign of Herod the Great, the age of Roman imperial rule, and the era extending from the conversion of Constantine to the Arabian conquest of the land. The work is marked by the same clarity, sustained interest, and absence of dogmatism which characterized the first volume. It is to be hoped that the author's promised evaluation of the material described in the present book will not be long delayed.

C. A. S.

Pharisaic Judaism in Transition. By Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1935, pp. x + 195. \$2.00.

Dr Bokser here gives us a thorough study of the rôle played by R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus in the difficult period of transition after the war with Rome, as a conservative force opposed to change in the *halakah*. He has dealt with the intricate sources in a masterly manner and makes available in English much material which is accessible only to a rabbinic scholar.

Several years ago Burton Scott Easton pointed out that when Pharisaism obtained mastery of the whole of Judaism it necessarily had to relax its rigorism; thus the Pharisaism envisaged in the earliest strata of gospel tradition reflects more truly the Pharisaism of the first half of the first century than does the milder religious law of R. Akiba. George Foot Moore had not reckoned sufficiently with these facts. Dr Bokser shows this shift taking place in the lifetime of R. Eliezer, who represents the old sectarian Pharisaism which had sympathies with the school of Shammai, in contrast to the liberalism of his colleagues. Much of the material in the book will be illuminating to New Testament students.

S. E. J.

Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut. Ed. by Salo W. Baron and Alexander Marx. The Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation (Bloch Publishing Company, New York), 1935, pp. xciii + 614 + 148. \$7.50.

The late George Alexander Kohut died December 31, 1933, and the present memorial volume is the work of a number of his friends and pupils. There is a brief biographical note by S. S. Wise and a bibliography which runs to 636 titles. His life extended from 1874 to 1933 (correct the figure on p. 111).

The contents of the memorial volume have a range almost as wide as that of Dr Kohut's interests and literary productions. 'Talmud Incunables of Spain and Portugal,' Notes upon Passages in Isaiah and Deuteronomy, 'The Haggada in the Church Fathers,' 'Hebrew Names of Modern Peoples,' 'Averroes on the Metaphysics of Aristotle,' 'Recent Literature on Philo,' 'the Problem of the Minim,' these are only a scattering selection from the thirty-two articles in the English and German section. At the end of the book appear ten articles and notes in Hebrew. Such articles as 'Oral Tradition in the Bible,' and the articles on Old Testament passages (Is. 49: 1-6; Deut. 33: 2-3, 24-25), and the article on Salt, should be given careful consideration by Christian scholars.

New Testament

A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. By Albert Huck. Ninth Edition. A Complete Revision of Earlier Editions by Hans Lietzmann. English Edition prepared in conjunction with the above by Frank Leslie Cross. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1936, pp. xx + 213. R.M. 3.60.

An English edition of Huck's Synopsis has been a 'long felt want' and here is an excellent one with critical notes abbreviated, though expanded in a few sections for the sake of practice in textual criticism. Parallels from the Fourth Gospel are indicated by framed references. The Prolegomena contain the earliest witnesses to the Synoptic Gospels and nothing else. The English section headings are in most cases translations of the German ones; the few exceptions to this seem unnecessary. Because of the reduced critical notes, the paging is not identical with that of the seventh and eighth German editions, but the section numbers remain the same.

A. H. F.

An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library. Edited by C. H. Roberts. Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1935, pp. 34. 2/6 net.

Of this fragment, John 18: 31-33 and 37-38, the editor writes, "Its importance may be stated very briefly: if the argument of the present article is correct, it is the earliest known fragment of any part of the New Testament and probably the earliest witness to the existence of the Gospel according to St. John." His book gives a photograph of the fragment, a prefatory note by Dr Guppy the librarian, an introduction and a restoration of the text with notes. On palaeographical grounds, the fragment is assigned to the first half of the second century.

A. H. F.

Jesus as Teacher. By Henry B. Sharman. New York: Harper, 1935, pp. 172. \$2.00.

A de luxe volume giving a classified selection of the teachings of Jesus, arranged in three main groups. The messianic material is segregated, not only because it seems alien to the mind of Jesus, but also because it supplies vividly the 'background of his activity and teaching.' The Johannine material is introduced as 'The record of John—Philosophy and Psychology of Religion.' The Sermon on the Mount is reconstructed, partly out of Matthean, partly out of Lucan materials. An epilogue is added—quoted verbatim out of Rudolf Bultmann, but without a line of credit to the author.

Now we object to all these things and we think it would have been better to print the sources as they are identified by the majority of modern New Testament scholars, viz. Q, L, Mark, M, etc. However, the book will probably do good. Any book that sets forth Jesus' teaching in readable and attractive format is likely to do this.

F. C. G.